

MODERN LANGUAGE NOTES

VOL. XXIII.

BALTIMORE, JUNE, 1908.

No. 6.

FAMILIA GOLIÆ.

Under the above title, Professor Manly adduces a new reason (*Modern Philology* 5. 201-9) for associating the term *Goliardi* with the Biblical name *Goliath*—namely, that in a sermon ascribed to St. Augustine, but really by Cæsarius of Arles (469-542), Goliath is made the type of the devil, not merely as 'the symbol of titanic and ruthless power,' but as 'the type of spiritual wickedness, the leader in this present life of the army of evil ones'; and that, as a portion of this sermon was read once a year at the Second Nocturn of the Fourth Sunday after Pentecost, the minds of churchmen would have been prepared to apply the phrase *familia Goliæ* 'as a term of reproach to the vagabond and recreant clerics of the Middle Ages.'

The portion of the sermon from which the preceding inferences are drawn is virtually comprised in these words: 'Quadragesima dies . . . vitam præsentem significant, in qua contra *Goliath vel exercitum ejus, id est, contra diabolum et angelos ejus*, Christianorum populus pugnare non desinit.' Goliath's army consists, therefore, of his angels, so that one does not quite see that 'the army of evil ones' would necessarily, on this ground alone, be a natural designation for 'the vagabond and recreant clerics of the Middle Ages.' Moreover, Professor Manly has not been able to determine at how early a date the sermon in question was drawn upon for the Lessons of that Second Nocturn; and therefore seems to feel that his argument is, for this reason, slightly deficient in cogency.

My object in this paper is to support the contention of Professor Manly by adducing some additional evidence of the same general tenor.

Ephrem Syrus died about ninety years before Cæsarius was born, and Ephrem Syrus, in one of his Syriac works, has a passage which is much to our purpose. His Syriac has thus been translated into Latin (*Opera*, Rome, 1737, 1. 367): 'Et quemadmodum David fere ubique Christum re-

præsentat, ita hoc loco Goliath diaboli personam gerit. Quadragesima ergo dies, quibus contra Dei populum terroribus ac minis dimicavit, designant tempus quo diabolus genus humanum oppugnavit, non vi nec armis, sed *arte sua alliciendo, terrendo, ac decipiendo*, donec ad singulare illud certamen ventum est, in quo a Christo primum in deserto post quadragesima ejus secessus dies, deinde in monte Calvario in fine dispensationis suæ victus et prostratus fuit.' Here the italicized words are important by reason of their possible application to the Goliards.

Augustine himself (ca. 354-430) touches more than once on the story. Thus (*Enarr. in Ps. 33: Patr. Lat. 36. 302*) he makes Goliath a type of the devil, and adds: 'Humilitas occidit superbiam.'¹ In another place (*Patr. Lat. 37. 1858*) he applies the cutting off of Goliath's head by his own sword to the destruction of the works of the devil by those who had formerly been his followers, but who now had been converted to Christianity. Compare also 38. 196-206.

The Greek Father, Theodoret († ca. 458), says that, just as the sword of Goliath cut off his own head, so when the devil had succeeded in crucifying Christ, that very crucifixion put an end to his despotism (*Patr. Gr. 1. 568*).

Gregory the Great, in his *Moralia* (on Job 27. 16, 17), makes Goliath stand for the pride of heretics—'Goliath vero hæreticorum superbiam signans' (*Patr. Lat. 76. 50*). This again may point forward to the recreant clerics. Incidentally, it may be noted that Augustine already employs the form *Goliath* (*Goliæ, Goliath*), as Gregory does here, and as their successors do in a majority of the instances I have noted.

Isidore of Seville says (*Patr. Lat. 83. 113*): 'Goliath designat diabolum, cujus elevationis superbiam Christi prostravit humilitas.' The pride of heretics above; the pride of the devil here.

Bede, in his commentary on I Samuel, chap.

¹ As late as Bernard of Clairvaux (*Patr. Lat. 183. 334*), Goliath designates the vice of pride. It may be noted that Superbia is a confident warrior in Prudentius, *Psych. 178 ff.*

17 (*Works*, ed. Giles, 8. 89 ff.) is full of matter germane to our theme. Thus, on v. 4, the camp of the Philistines is the hearts of the wicked, from which the devil daily goes forth to rebel against God. If the name Goliath be interpreted as *transmigrans*, then if this verb be taken in an active sense, it denotes the activity of the devil in transferring all those who follow him from the Land of Promise to the land of perdition. The Vulgate calls Goliath *spurius*, by a misinterpretation of the Hebrew word which applies to the interspace between the two armies. This *spurius* means, according to Bede, that Goliath was born of an ignoble father, but a noble mother. This, again, might be thought to apply to those Goliard clerks who, sprung from the bosom of Holy Church, were yet bastard sons, inasmuch as they were not true to the mother who bore them; though, of course, Bede knows nothing of these Goliards.

Again, the various pieces of Goliath's defensive armor are to Bede various sorts of arguments or arguers whereby diabolical folly is defended. The devil protects his head when, although damned, he does not hesitate to announce himself as God. He protects his body when he puts it into the heart of the wicked to invent excuses for their evil deeds. All this defensive armor is made of brass, the most sonorous of metals, 'quia sive opera nefanda, seu dogma perversum, non invictæ veritatis agnita ratione, sed fabulosa dulcedine consuevit eloquentiæ defendere secularis.' Might not this have been subsequently turned against the Goliards, when we consider the vogue of Bede's works in the Middle Ages?

On v. 7 Bede continues—and its pertinence to our discussion will be evident: 'Namque opus quidem eorum quos adversus ecclesiam diabolus ad certamen profert, quasi ad texendum justitiæ et sanctitatis indumentum, oculis insipientium videtur aptissimum. *Ipsium autem acumen dicendi non aliquid ultra mundi hujus, qui sex ætatibus perstat, terminos intueri ac dicere novit. Qui cum tanti sint ingenii, ut possint æstimare seculum, Creatorem tamen ejus invenire nesciunt. . . . Et sicut in Psalmo centesimo quadragesimo tertio [Ps. 144. 8], qui proprie adversus Goliath scribitur, victor ejusdem Goliath Psalmista testatur: Quorum os locutum est vanitatem, et dextera eorum dextera iniquitatis.*'

Bede goes on to point out the pride which is an attribute of the devil, and to make David prefigure Christ. He adds (v. 23): 'Apparuit hostis antiquus ex impiorum præcordiis ascendens, et per actiones linguasque eorum nefarias malitiæ suæ superbæ contra electos, quod et hodie facit, venena dira jaculans.'

Another significant passage is the following (v. 43): 'Maledicit et per hæreticos corpori veri David in diis suis, cum fictos de corde suo ac pessimo igni conflatos sensus, evangelicæ veritati præponere docet; qui etiam carnalia docentes, spiritualium dicta vel acta præsumant se posse convincere. Talia magis gentilium superbis philosophis, vel barbaris quibusdam—his enim volucres cæli, ac bestię terræ, possunt decentissima significatione conferri—quam ecclesiasticæ eruditioni et humilitati congruere.'

Finally, two other extracts, on vv. 49 and 51 respectively, will illustrate the same theory of Bede's, according to which—in this respect resembling Ephrem Syrus—the power of the devil and his adherents is regarded as consisting in eloquence and cajolery, and its devilishness in its falseness: 'Percussus autem lapide cecidit in terram gigas; quia pulsatus Dei verbo *diabolicus error*, nequaquam celsus, ut multo ante tempore jactabat, et cælestis, sed terrenus fuisse innotuit, et infimus.'

'Sed et nos cum hæreticorum vesaniæ disputando occurrentes, non aliis quam his quæ ipsi ad nos reducendos proposuerant, vel argumentationum probamentis, vel testimoniis Scripturarum convincimus, eos *fabricatores mendaciæ*, et cultores esse perversorum dogmatum; gigantis profecto proterviam suo ense dejicimus.'

Rabanus Maurus, in one passage (*Patr. Lat.* 111. 58) merely considers Goliath as standing for the devil. Another passage (109. 52–3) is more important, since it rehearses some of the significant ideas presented above: 'Convertunt linguas suas contra diabolum, et sic Goliæ de gladio suo caput inciditur. (*Ex Gregorio.*) Item vir certa fide plenus, quæ sanctis solet ad justitiam computari, et ipsa Scripturæ sacræ, quæ hæreticus affert, testimonia colligit, et erroris ejus pertinaciam inde convincit. Contra nos namque dum sacræ Legis testimonia adportant, secum nobis afferunt unde vincantur. Unde et David typum Domini, qui videlicet *fortis manu* interpretatur; Goliath vero,

revelatus sive *transmigrans*, hæreticorum superbiam signans, hoc rebus locuti sunt quod nos verbis aperimus. Goliath quippe cum gladio, David vero cum pera pastoralis venit ad prælium. Sed eundem Goliath David superans, suo occidit gladio. Quod nos quoque agimus, qui promissi David membra ex ejus fieri dignatione meruimus: nam superbientes hæreticos et sacræ Scripturæ sententias deferentes, eisdem verbis atque sententiis quas proferunt vincimus.²

One of the chief intermediaries between the earlier and the later Middle Ages, so far as Biblical commentary went, was Walafrid Strabo. In his *Glossa Ordinaria* (*Patr. Lat.* 113. 536-7), which, according to the Benedictine authors of the *Histoire Littéraire de la France* (9. 21), represented to the twelfth century the complete understanding of Scripture, and from which, according to no less an authority than M. Samuel Berger, the greater part of the thirteenth century commentary on the French Bible is drawn (see Male, *L'Art Religieux en France au XIII^e Siècle*, p. 187), has the following: 'Goliath vero superbiam diaboli significat. . . . Christus diabolum de suis membris occidit quando crediderunt magi quos ille in manu habebat, et de quibus alios trucidabat, convertentes linguas suas contra diabolum, et sic Goliath gladio suo caput abscindunt.'

There was, therefore, no lack of means for making the clergy of the Middle Ages acquainted with the character attributed with general consistency to Goliath from the fourth century on. That the name and deeds of the giant were familiar throughout the mediæval period is indicated by Dante's allusions (*Mon.* 2. 10. 86-7 Moore; *Ep.* 7. 178-183); by Chaucer's (*Man of Law's Tale* 934)

O Goliath, unmesurable of length;

by the *Goliath* (*Goli*, *Goly*) of the *Cursor Mundi* (7443, 7553, 7575, 7577); and by the frequent use of the name to designate Saracen warriors in

²Cf. Chrysostom, *Hom.* 38 on First Corinthians (on v. 3): 'Seest thou how nothing is weaker than error? And how it is taken by its own wings, and needs not the warfare from without, but by itself it is pierced through? Consider, for instance, these men, how they too have pierced themselves through by their own statements.'

the Carolingian epic.³ The spelling *Goliath* is found as late as Shakespeare (*I Hen.* VI 1. 2. 33), side by side with *Goliath* (*M. W.* 5. 1. 23).

Familia is not an uncommon word in the Middle Ages to designate a monastic community. Thus Æthelbald of Mercia (A. D. 747) makes a gift (Kemble, *Cod. Dipl.* 1. 116) 'Mildredæ religiosæ abbatissæ ejusque venerabili familiæ quæ una cum ea conversatur in insula Thænet' (similarly 1. 117). So Cynewulf of Mercia (1. 125) 'familiæ Christi in Maldubiensi monasterio constitutæ.' Cf. 1. 129, 182, 230. Oswald (963) makes a gift (2. 398) 'familiæ Wiogornensis ecclesiæ.' The corresponding term in Old English was *hired* (sometimes *hīwan*, plur.),⁴ Thus, Wulfstan 184. 26-7: 'æt ælcan tidsange eal *hired* āpenedum limum ætforan Godes weofode singe pone sealm'; cf. *Cod. Dipl.* 2. 3 (line 36).

It would be desirable to ascertain with more certainty the date of the *Constitution* attributed by Mansi (*Conc.* 18. 324) to Gautier of Sens († 913): 'Statuimus quod clerici ribaldi, maxime qui dicuntur de familiæ Goliæ,' etc. It is usually assumed that this date is much too early; but Chambers, *Med. Stage*, 1. 61, seems inclined to attach some weight to Mansi's attribution.

ALBERT S. COOK.

Yale University.

VILLONIANA.

The facetious legacy in verse does not rank high in the list of even the minor genres: except Villon, one can hardly name an important poet who has made use of it.¹ The fact is the more

³Thus *Pèl. de Charl.* 424; *Charroi de Nîmes* 518; *Prise d'Orange* 346, etc.; *Aliscans* 3965, etc.; *Prise de Cordres* 1162; *Enfances Vivien* 510 (all ca. 1160-1200); then *Garin le Loherain* 625 (Tartar name); *Anseis de Carthage* 2480, etc.; *Henri de Metz* 8780; *Octavian* 1311, etc.; *Maugis d'Aigremont* 1766; etc., etc. I owe these references to the kindness of my colleague, Professor Frederick M. Warren.

⁴The list, however, includes Jean Bodel, Adam de la Halle, Jean de Meung, Eustache Deschamps, William Dunbar, with his *Testament of Andro Kennedy*, and Jean Regnier, author of the *Livre de la Prison*, printed in 1526.

remarkable that, using this insignificant form and drawing upon little else than his own life experience, François Villon should have been able to produce an imperishable work of art. His poems consist essentially in poignant thrusts, some witty, some humorous and most of them innocent enough, at friends, acquaintances and enemies. Add to these satiric hits the revelations of the inner life, brief but intense, of a semi-medieval townsman, fuse the words, verse and strophic form into an inseparable whole, and we have the *Lais* and the *Testament*.² In Villon's hands the facetious legacy rises to the dignity of vivid satire and interesting personal confession; and the whole is written in an individual and distinguished style.

To the series of *Congés* and *Testaments* written in verse before Villon and reviewed by G. Paris,³ may be added a few others, but they serve only to strengthen the conviction that Maître François Villon, except in his versification, was independent of predecessors. Guillaume de Machaut, for example, had inserted a sort of Last Will in the *Voir Dit*.⁴ *Je fis mon testament*, he tells us, *Et a ma dame l'envoïay*. It is in ballade form:

Mr. Samuel T. Pickard, literary executor of John Greenleaf Whittier, is authority for the statement that there exists among the Quaker poet's unpublished papers a "Last Will and Testament of a Man caught in a Bear-trap." While waiting for death a citizen of Amesbury is represented as disposing of his goods and chattels: in doing so he comments upon the character of the legatees in an amusing manner. (See a letter of William E. Curtis in the *Chicago Record-Herald*, Aug. 19, 1907.) As a curiosity, I mention the last will and testament (in prose) of Charles Lounsbury, who is said to have died in the insane asylum at Dunning, Illinois. After a formal preamble come the bequests, of which the following is a specimen: "Item, I leave to children inclusively, but only for the term of their childhood, all and every, the flowers of the fields, and the blossoms of the woods, with the right to play among them freely according to the customs of children, warning them at the same time against thistles and thorns. And I leave the children the long, long days to be merry in, in a thousand ways, and the night and the moon and the train of the milky way to wonder at, but subject nevertheless to the rights herein-after given to lovers." Further details in *Charities and the Commons*, Vol. XVIII, p. 509.

²The old titles, *Petit Testament* and *Grand Testament*, should be discarded as without basis in tradition and contrary to the poet's own indications. (*Test.*, 78 and 755-8.)

³G. Paris, *François Villon*, 1901, p. 120 f.

⁴Ed. P. Paris, p. 25.

Pleurés, dames. . . .

Vestés vous de noir pour mi,
Car j'ay cuer taint et viaire palli,
Et si me voy de mort en aventure
Se Dieus et vous ne me prenés en cure.

Mon cuer vous lais et met en vo command,
Et l'ame a Dieu devotement presente,
Et voist ou doit aler le remenant;
La char aus vers, car c'est leur droite rente
Et l'avoirs soit departi
Aus povres gens. . . .

The *Testament allégorique* of Charles of Orléans,⁵ with whom Villon was in more or less intimate relations at one period, is also in ballade form and hardly more striking:

Puisque mort a prins ma maistresse
Que sur toutes amer souloye,
Mourir me convient en tristesse,
Certes plus vivre ne pourroye.
Pour ce, par defaulte de joye,
Tres malade, mon testament
J'ay mis en escript doloieux
Lequel je présente humblement
Devant tous loyaulx amoureux.

The duke's bequests are few: he gives "mon esperit a la haultesse du Dieu d'Amours"; "la richesse des biens d'Amours" shall be divided among all 'vrais amans,' and finally,

Sans espargner or ne monnoye,
Loyauté veult qu'enterré soye
En sa chappelle grandement. . . .

The *Testament* of Eustache Deschamps,⁶ overlooked accidentally by G. Paris, is much more elaborate. The *Autres Lettres Envoyées par Eustache luy estant malade et la manière de son Testament par Esbatement* form a poem of 104 lines in octosyllabic couplets. Some of his many bequests resemble those of Villon, but hardly enough to prove a connection.

II.

The following observations bear upon matters of interpretation and text readings. The references are to Von Wurzbach's text, 1903.

Test. 117, *viel en viellesse*. Both the sense and the original in Jean de Meung's *Codicille* call for

⁵Ed. Champollion-Figeac, 1842, p. 149.

⁶*Œuvres complètes*, VIII, 29-32. See also Hoeffner's *Eustache Deschamps*, pp. 52 and 184, n. 4.

meur en viellesse. The mistake can hardly be Villon's.

Test. 129 f. The Diomedes episode is the longest piece of pure narrative in Villon, and is otherwise of more than ordinary interest as being a veritable *apologia pro vita sua*. It has escaped notice that Villon's verses contain more than one verbal reminiscence of the Latin original, the *Polieraticus* of John of Salisbury. I reprint parts of the original passage, from the text in Migne, cxcix :

In Græcia quis major aut clarior Alexandro ?
Eidem quoque eleganter et vere comprehensus
pirata scribitur respondisse. Cum enim Alexander interrogaret, quid ei videretur quod mare haberet infestum, ille libera contumacia, "Quid tibi, inquit, ut tu orbem terrarum ? Sed quia id ego uno navigio facio, latro vocor ; quia tu magna classe, disceris imperator. Si solus, et captus sit Alexander, latro erit. Si ad nutum Dionidi (*sic*) populi famulentur, erit Dionides imperator. . . .
Me fortunæ iniquitas, et rei familiaris angustia, te fastus intolerabilis et inexplabilis avaritia, furem facit. Si fortuna mansuesceret, fierem forte melior. At tu quo fortunatior, eo nequior eris."

MIRATUS ALEXANDER constantiam hominis eum merito ARGUMENTIS, "Experiar, inquit, an futurus sis melior, FORTUNAMQUE MUTABO, ut non ei a modo deliqueris, sed tuis moribus ascribatur."

Eum itaque jussit conscribi militiæ, ut posset exinde SALVIS LEGIBUS militare.

Cp. *Test.*, xx :

Quant l'empereur ot remiré
De Diomedès tout le dit ;
"Ta fortune je te mueray,
Mauvaise en bonne" si luy dit.
Ce fist il. Onc puis ne mesfit
A personne. . . .

XXI :

Se Dieu m'eust donné rencontrer
Ung autre piteux Alixandre
Qui m'eust fait en boneur entrer. . . .
Necessité fait gens mesprendre
Et faim saillir le loup du bois.

Villon, characteristically, was ever ready to ascribe his sufferings to the persecutions of Fortune (cp. *PD.* 380, 442, 459 ff.), and the passages in

italics no doubt struck his attention as marvelously fitting his own pitiable case.

Test. 339, *Esbaillart*. The interchange of prefix is easily paralleled from Langlois' *Table des Noms propres*: *Acopert*—*Escopert*, *Apolice*—*Es-police*, etc. The Latin forms are *Abælardus*, *Abaiçlardus*, the latter occurring in the Latin poems attributed to Walter Map (ed. Wright, p. 28). In this connection I add an interesting suggestion of Dr. C. J. Cipriani, that *Abælard* may possibly be a compound of the Welsh *Ap* or *Ab* with the Germanic *Adalhard*. There is no phonetic objection to this etymology, and, as Dr. Cipriani points out, other instances of Germanic names with the Celtic word prefixed are not unknown.

Test. 355, *remaine*. As far as morphology goes, the word is susceptible of different interpretations. Paris rejected Longnon's idea (from *remanoir*) without however explaining his own. From *PD.*, 35 and 267, *remaine* would seem to be *Sbj.* Ps. 1 of *remener*, in the sense of 'quote, quote again, reiterate.'

Test. 448, *emprunter elles*. *Elles* may possibly not be reflexive (Longnon), but may represent *ilz*, i. e., *famelettes*, while *emprunter* is 'borrow,' in the sense of 'imitate, follow in the footsteps of.' Cp. Montaigne I, ch. xxv: *Il sondera la portée d'un chascun: un bouvier, un masson, un passant, il fault . . . emprunter chascun selon sa marchandise.*

Test. 636. A Cerberus with four heads is, I believe, unique. From medieval sources Prof. Bloomfield⁷ might have gathered many other curious additions to his interesting review of the transformations of the Dog of Hades.⁸

Test. 670, *fol s'y fia*. Editors of the text should

⁷ Cerberus, the Dog of Hades. The History of an Idea, by Maurice Bloomfield, Chicago, 1905.

⁸ To Jean de Meung, *Roman de la Rose*, 20737 ff., Cerberus is "*Cis mastins*," who hangs to the three breasts of Atropos; to the author of the *Chanson d'Antioche* (II, p. 129) he is a devil and a workman (*manouvrier*) who builds a tower; to Guillaume de Machaut he is one of the four "*roys d'enfer*" along with Pluto, Floron and Lucifer. Eustache Deschamps tells us that Cerberus, "*dieu d'enfer*," was seen in his time carried about in effigy:

Au monde voit on porter Cerberus
O ses .iii. chiefs. . . . *Oeuvres*, I, p. 251.

refer to Tobler's *Beiträge*, I, 2, p. 217, and to Keidel, *Modern Language Notes*, x, col. 146 f.

Test. 685, *elle* may possibly mean 'elbow,' as in Gringore, *Soties* (ed. Picot, II, p. 35) : *Sus ! Qui est ce qui se frotte en mon elle ?*

Test. 752. It is possible that in this passage the Lord is cited as hating the Lombards not, as commonly, because they are tricky merchants, usurers or misers, but as heretics.

Test. 852, *levé de maillon* 'baptized in swaddling clothes'; *lever* in the sense 'to hold at the baptismal font' in Deschamps, I, p. 147. Cp. also *levare de sacro fonte*, quoted by Diez, *Dict.*, I, p. 12, s. v. *allevare*.

Test. 952. This unintelligible line may be emended by reading *sachier* (f) while *fait* may be taken in the sense of 'business, affair,' as in *Test.* 665, 667, 1087.

Test. 1126 ff. The two strophes are obscure. Von Wurzbach's note only adds to the confusion. The expressions *Prins à mastins* (1130) and *prins à [so AFI] un piège* (1138) are plainly in opposition. Apparently, one duty of the archers was to hunt and kill wolves, which we know were troublesome in winter in the vicinity of Paris. Possibly a bounty was paid for their heads (*hures*), hence the desirability of the bequest. Villon, whether in jest or not, says that wolves' heads (brains?) make a delicate morsel. As food it is light, and would make good provisions for campaigning. If the butchers' dogs prove useless as hunters, and traps are resorted to, then (as the skins would be whole, not torn) Villon, who is a good judge of pelts, directs that they be made into fur garments for the archers in winter. Labouche, *Les Arts et Métiers*, 1884, tells us : Les bouchers ont longtemps nourri de gros chiens qui voituraient la viande sur de petites charrettes de l'abat-toir aux boucheries.⁹

As parallels to the double protasis¹⁰ in lines 1138-9 may be cited from Chrétien, *Charrette* 3659 :

⁹ These *mastins*, *vieux chiens de boucherie*, are also mentioned in the Legend of Pierre Faifeu, p. 39. See also an illustration, *Piège pour prendre Loups*, fifteenth century, in Lacroix, *Mœurs, Usages et Costumes au Moyen Age*, 1878, p. 208.

¹⁰ Cp. also Lücking, *Grammatik*, § 562.

se il la savoit
A la fenestre ou ele estoit,
Qu'ele l'esgardast ne vëist,
Force et hardement en prëist.

and from Wace, *Rou* 6261 :

Et se je fail a mon dreit prendre,
Qu'Engleis se pöissent defendre,
Ja n'i perdrai mais que la teste.

Test. 1287, *Ave salus, Tibi decus*. The second of these two snatches of ecclesiastical Latin may be a garbled reminiscence of the vesper hymn *Tibi, Christe, dux et decus, | Certa spes fidelium* (Chevalier, No. 20446). Two hymns (Nos. 2094, 2095) begin with the words *Ave, salus*. . .

Test. 1398 ff. *semer (graine) dans un champ*, in the sense understood here by Longnon, is indeed a common figure of speech, and as old at least as Plato's *Timæus*. Nevertheless, it is not impossible that Villon may have used it here in the sense of 'devote attention to' a person or thing, a meaning for which there is ample precedent in the Parable of the Sower. Thus Rutebeuf, *Complainte du Conte de Nevers*, 91 ff. :

Lasus els cieus fet bon semer ;
N'estuet pas la terre femer
Ne ne s'i puet repestre oisiaus. . .

Besides, the reading *quant le fruit me ressemble* has poor support : IF have *le fait*, and the meaning may be, 'seeing that the occupation (of devoting attention to you) is to my liking.' Moreover, Longnon's idea tends to remove the ballade from the time of Robert d'Estouteville's courtship where, from its general tone, it seems to me to most fittingly belong.¹¹

¹¹ I add the passages from Jean de Roye relating to Ambroise de Loré :

I, 12 : Et lors, par maistre Jean Avin, conseiller lay en la court de Parlement, furent fais plusieurs exploits en l'hostel dudit d'Estouteville comme de chercher boistes, cofres et autres lieux pour savoir si on y trouveroit nulles lettres : et fist plusieurs rudesses oudit hostel a dame Ambroise de Loré, femme dudit d'Estouteville, qui estoit moult sage, noble et honneste dame. Dieu de ses exploits le veuille punir. . .

I, 201 (at her death, 5 mai 1468) : et fu fort plainte pour ce qu'elle estoit noble dame, bonne et honneste, et en l'hostel de laquelle toutes nobles et honnestes personnes estoient honorablement receuz. (Ed. Mandrot, 1894.)

Test. 1486. *n'acoutassent*, to which G. Paris objected, seems intended to reproduce the *froyée* of the original *Dit de Franc Gontier*, I, 7 (text by Piaget) :

Soubz feuille vert, sur herbe delitable
Lez ru bruant et prez clere fontaine,
Trouvay fichée une borde portable.
Ilec mengeoit Gontier o dame Helayne
5 Fromage frais, lait, burre, fromagée,
Craime, matton, pomme, nois, prune, poire,
Aulx et oignons, escaillongne froyée
Sur crouste bise, au gros sel, pour mieulx boire.

Test. 1662. *doivent estre retrouvez* may be taken as equivalent to *seront retrouvez*, 'they will be found assembled, very naturally, at the house of Marion l'Ydolle,' as foreshadowed in ll. 1628 ff. Grammatically, the phrase seems analogous to the case of omission of the pronoun in compound tenses of reflexive verbs (Tobler, *Beiträge*, II, p. 57).

Test. 1741, *de ce prest estre*. This confusion of *prêt* and *près*, due to phonetic causes, is well known. Haase, *Syntaxe*, 112, 3 ; etc.

Test. 1861, *aller de mort a vie*. G. Paris remarked : Entendez naturellement *de vie à mort*. Ce genre de plaisanterie charmait Rabelais qui en fait un fréquent usage. Rabelais, it is true, would "kill a comb for a tailor" (I, xxxiii), but Villon's expression may possibly be a souvenir of the church formula "from death unto life (eternal)." Speaking of the Gospel according to John, the author of the Old French *Eruetavit* says :

N'i a celui qui miauz vos die
Comant Deus vint de mort a vie.

ll. 1025-6.

And elsewhere, speaking of Christ :

La biautez qui an vos sera
Quant vos vandroiz de mort a vie.

ll. 453-4.

Similarly, *Miracles de Notre Dame*, II, p. 5 : *Par son chier filz sommes apellé de mort a vie*.

III.

PD. 267-8 :

A ce propos un dit remaine :
De saige mere saige enfant.

A prominent characteristic of Villon's style is his habit of closing his huitains with an observation of general application, often a current saying,

maxim or proverb.¹² About forty strophes end in this manner in a total of upwards of two hundred. Is this habit an isolated peculiarity, or may it indicate the poet's connection with the traditions of some literary group? To summarize some results obtained from an examination of contemporary verse, made with the assistance of some of my pupils, it is convenient to distinguish several cases :

I. The author makes an original reflection of a general character, or is reminded of a current saying, and inserts it in the body of his strophe, or at the end, without particular intention.

II. The author habitually places a general remark at the end of the strophe, often using proverbs for the purpose, so that the practice amounts to a peculiarity of style. Villon may be classed here.

III. The author intentionally ends every strophe with a proverb, which *a*) resumes the strophe, or *b*) to which the strophe is only an introduction and explanation. Examples : of *a*) *Complainte V* of Charles of Orléans ; of *b*) *Li Proverbe au Vilain*, ed. Tobler, 1895.

IV. The author composes strophes entirely of proverbs. Examples are Villon's *Ballade des Proverbes*, the *Mimes* of Bâif, etc.

Alain Chartier and Charles of Orléans are very sparing in their use of proverbs, either in mid-strophe, or at the end. Out of almost a thousand strophes, mostly huitains, some fifty instances might be cited. Besides the *Complainte* just mentioned, Charles of Orléans composed a *Rondel* entirely of proverbs :

Comme j'oy que chacun devise,
On n'est pas tousiours a sa guise,
Beau chanter si ennuie bien,
Jeu qui trop dure ne vault rien,
Tant va le pot a l'eau qu'il brise. Etc.

In seventeen *Soties* in Picot's collection, although the editor prepares us for a different result, examination reveals no more than about a score in a total of over 7,500 verses. In Greban's *Mystère de la Passion*, aside from a speech of Lazarus thrown exceptionally into strophic form, there seem to be not over a dozen sententious

¹² Sébillot's article on Villon's proverbs (*Revue des Traditions populaires*, III, 463) is unimportant.

remarks, much less common proverbs. The speech of Lazarus¹³ is in nine septains, each ending with a moral remark of general application. In the Picot-Nyrop collection, in some 3,000 lines, there occur but eight proverbs, and about the same number of general maxims, evidently original for the most part.

Turning to popular verse not in dramatic form, the number of strophes where the proverb-end is a common or constant feature, increases suddenly. At least ten poems in the first nine volumes of the Montaignon-Rothschild collection will fall under class II. They are: *Doctrinal des nouveaux Mariés* (i, 131); *Débat de Nature et Jeunesse* (iii, 84); *Ny trop tost ni trop tard Marié* (iii, 129); *Débat de la Dame et de l'Escuyer* (iv, 151); *Testament de Monseigneur des Barres* (vi, 102); *Débat de l'homme et de l'Argent* (vii, 302); *Réformation des Dames de Paris* (viii, 244); *L'Amant rendu au Couvent de Tristesse* (ix, 321); *Regrets de Picardie* (ix, 297); *Le grant Jubilé de Millan* (ix, 337). In all, a total of some 332 strophes, of which 40 end in what may be called proverbs.

Popular poems of the type of class III are very numerous at the period in question. The list examined includes the following: *La Danse Macabré des Hommes et des Femmes* (Collection Sylvestre); G. Coquillart, *Complainte d'Echo*; *Diet des Bestes et des Oyseaux* (M-R, i, 256); *Les Neuf Preux de Gourmandise* (ii, 38); *La Folye des Angloys* (ii, 253); *Les Loix de Mariage* and *Sequel to same* (iii, 168); *Le Songe Doré de la Pucelle* (iii, 204); *Le Débat du Jeune et du Vieulx Amoureux* (vii, 211); R. Gaguin's *Passetemps de l'Oisiveté* (vii, 225); *La Complainte de Venise* (v, 120), and three poems from Le Roux's *Recueil de Chants historiques*: a *Ballade envoyée par les Anglois*, the *Ballade de Fougères*, and the *Chanson contre Hugues Aubriot*. In a total of 715 strophes, 659 end in proverbs and maxims.

The general result, therefore, is to emphasize Villon's indifference to the aristocratic literature of the period, and his close affiliation with the bourgeois muse. As Paris said, he was not merely a *poète de ville*, but a *poète de quartier*. Yet, although his circle was narrow, he was far

above the common rhymesters whose excessive use of proverbs condemns their work to hopeless commonplace and the exclusion of what is personal and distinguished.

Villon's use of proverbs is also additional evidence that he was not greatly influenced by the learned world, then much addicted to dealing in quotable wisdom. Once (PD. 259) he cites in Latin a phrase from the "*escripture de Caton*," but with this exception his proverbs are from popular rather than learned sources.

Evidently the practice of placing a proverb in the culminating line of a strophe of fixed form is instructive as reflecting in a measure the intellectual range of the fifteenth century bourgeoisie. But the tendency itself is much older, and seems inherent to some extent in the strophe of fixed form. Thus De Gramont¹⁴ says, apropos of the sonnet: "Il est indispensable que le dernier vers, celui qui achève le sentiment ou le tableau, fasse réellement conclusion par quelque chose d'heureux ou de frappant, soit dans l'idée soit dans l'expression, *ni plus ni moins d'ailleurs que ne doit faire le vers terminal d'une simple strophe*." So in the *Romans de Carité et de Misere*, observes Van Hamel,¹⁵ "le poète annonce son idée dans les trois premiers vers: ensuite il la développe dans les six vers (4-9) et enfin il la résume ou il en tire une conclusion dans les trois vers de la fin." In the 515 strophes of these two poems, some 23 may fall under our class II. In Helinand's *Vers de la Mort* the tendency is much more marked, for out of the 50 strophes 12 end with proverbs or generalizations. The tendency becomes rare when we emerge into the "spacious" air of the Renaissance.¹⁶ The epigrams of Marot, for example, are nearly all in strophes of fixed form (sixains, huitains, dizains, etc.), yet there seem to be no cases which would fall under our classes II and III.

Finally, there existed in Villon's day another obvious incentive to reserve the last line of the strophe for an epigrammatic phrase, maxim or saying that would bear repetition: the refrain of the ballade. In the fourteenth century, when

¹³ Lines 15,794 ff.

¹⁴ *Les Vers français et leur Prosodie*, p. 253.

¹⁵ Introduction, p. xciv.

¹⁶ This statement, of course, does not apply to the Senecan tragedy, not in strophic form.

lyric poetry was turned in the didactic direction, the refrain also becomes tinged with didacticism. The bourgeois *pays* often gave out for competition quotable verses embodying a general truth. The ballade refrains of Deschamps are frequently maxims or proverbs: those of Charles of Orléans and the authors of the *Livre de Cent Ballades* are comparatively free from the tendency. The extent to which this motive influenced Villon may be judged from the fact that one-fourth of his twenty-eight ballade refrains are sayings or current phrases.

T. ATKINSON JENKINS.

University of Chicago.

CHAUCERIANA. I.

THE DATE OF *The Clerk's Tale*.

Certain English Chaucerian scholars date *The Clerk's Tale* immediately after Chaucer's first journey to Italy; a conjecture which partly rests on the supposition that he was personally indebted for the story of Griselda to Petrarch, at a meeting of the two poets, which has been accepted as very probable by many Chaucer and Petrarch students.¹ Dr. J. S. P. Tatlock, in a well sustained argument against the whole of this theory, suggests that while there is no evidence for such a meeting, and no need of it in order to account for Chaucer's obtaining the Latin version, as "considering the reputation both of the *Decameron* and of Petrarch, mss. of his cultivated Latinization of its last tale are likely to have been speedily multiplied." As evidence of the early and wide-spread acquaintance with Petrarch's version, he calls attention to the version found in the *Menagier de Paris*, which was probably written 1392-4.² Quite as apposite to the matter in question, is the French dramati-

zation of Petrarch's version, found in a fifteenth century manuscript of the Bibliothèque nationale, f. fr. 2203, in which the date of the work is given as 1395.³ A version of a slightly later date in twelve line strophes, by a Lombard "Franchois Pietat" has been printed from a fifteenth century Bodleian Manuscript, Douce 99.⁴ Two Dutch versions were written about 1400⁵; an analysis of it appears in a Spanish moral treatise, which is to be assigned to the same date,⁶ as well as the translation into Catalan by Bernart Metge.⁷

Some of Petrarch's other Latin works had an equal fortune in being translated into other languages than Italian at an early date. If the main body of the *Res memorandae* was written in 1344,⁸ it was still unfinished when Petrarch died in 1374⁹; and as late as July 13, 1379, Coluccio Salutati, who was in close touch with the executors of the poet, asks for a copy in a letter written in regard to a copy of another uncompleted work, *De Viris*.¹⁰ Yet in 1393¹¹ Gower introduced into his second version of the *Confessio Amantis*¹² the story of Dante and the court sycophant, which Petrarch

¹ H. Groeneveld, *Die älteste Bearbeitungen der Griseldissage in Frankreich*, Marburg, 1886, Aug. u. Abhl. LXXIX, v-vi, xxxvi-xxxvii; cf. Petit de Julleville, *Les mystères*, I, 180, II, 342. This manuscript was already noted by Pichon, *Menagier de Paris*, p. 99.

² R. Hofmeister, in *Festschrift des Königl. Realgymnasiums zu Erfurt*, 1894, No. 8, p. 1; cf. Groeneveld, *l. c.* xxx, xxxi. On a later fifteenth century metrical version cf. R. Köhler, *Kleinere Schriften*, II, 519.

³ J. Bolte, in Köhler, *l. c.* 511.

⁴ H. Knust, *Jahrb. f. rom. u. engl. Lit.*, x, 36; Köhler, *l. c.* II, 511; A. Farinelli, *Giorn. storico della lett. ital.*, XLIV, 316; C. B. Bourland, *Revue hispanique*, XII, 168-171.

⁵ Wannenmacher, *Die Griseldissage*, 1904, 103; Morel-Fatio, Gröber's *Grundriss*, II, 3, 109, 125; Farinelli, *l. c.* 312, 315; Bourland, *l. c.*, 211-213. Like Chaucer, Metge speaks with devotion of Petrarch, and does not mention Boccaccio, from whose *Corbaccio*, however, he filched the whole of the tirade against women of his "Tiresias." Farinelli, *l. c.*, 312.

⁶ Gaspary, *Gesch. der ital. Lit.*, I, 436; Kirner, *Giorn. stor.*, XVI, 409; cf. de Nolhac, *Not. et Extr.*, XXXIV, I, 109, 113.

⁷ Vita of Pietro da Castelletto, in Solerti, *Le vite di Dante, del P. e del Bocc.*, 272; Gaspary, I, 436.

⁸ Novati, *Epistolario di Coluccio Salutati*, I, 330-1.

⁹ On date, cf. *Works of Gower*, ed. Macaulay, I, xxiii, cxxxiv; H. Spies, *Engl. Stud.*, XXXII, 258.

¹⁰ *Conf. am.* 2359* ff. 13: cf. Tatlock, *l. c.*, 221, n. 3.

¹ To Tatlock's bibliography add Belleza, *Giorn. stor.*, XLII, 460, for a note on the Italian supporters of the thesis.

² *The Development and Chronology of Chaucer's Works*, 1907, 156; cf. 161 n. (Cf. a different version found in ms. Bibl. nat. 7387 (Pichon, *Menagier de Paris*, I, 99), which may be the same as that found in some imprints. R. Köhler, *Kleinere Schriften*. II. 509-510).

was the first to tell in the *Res memorandae*.¹³ The *De remediis*, which was only finished Nov. 4, 1366,¹⁴ was translated by Jean Daudin into French before April 14, 1378, when Charles V ordered 200 francs to be paid him for translating "un livre appellé Patrac";¹⁵ and a translation of his version of the Penitential Psalms is dated Nov. 17, 1409.¹⁶ Manuscripts with selections of the Latin works, including the Griselda story, are found in France early in the fifteenth century,¹⁷ and a copy of his *Letters* is noted in the original catalogue of the library of Peterhouse, Cambridge, of 1426.¹⁸ Among the books presented to Corpus Christi College, Cambridge, by T. Markaunt in 1439 was a "Tractatus de Waltero et Griselda uxores ejus,"¹⁹ and a copy was in the library of St. Catherine's Hall, presented by the founder in 1475.²⁰ In Queen's College, Oxford, John Leland found on one of his visits between 1530-1546 a copy of Petrarch's version of Boccaccio's story²¹; and the manuscripts found by Bernard²²

at the end of the seventeenth century, in the Laud collection at the Bodleian, and in Magdalen College, Oxford, and in Benet²³—Corpus Christi—College, Cambridge, vouch for its vogue in England in the separate manuscript form, in which it was probably known to Chaucer.

As there is not a single instance of a copy of the *Canzoniere* of Petrarch, or of the numerous works in vernacular of Boccaccio appearing in the various fifteenth century English library catalogues, in which not unfrequent entries are found of their Latin works, the reputation of the *Decamerone*, for spreading the reputation of the story of Griselda, need not be considered. It was through the intermediary of the Latin version that the story under Petrarch's authorship passed through Europe as a chap-book.²⁴ The first French translation of the *Decamerone*, made in the early years of the fifteenth century by Laurent de Premierfait, was based on a Latin version of an Italian collaborator²⁵; and in one manuscript of this translation, a translation of Petrarch's version has been substituted for that of the original of Boccaccio.²⁶ The only *Decamerone* manuscript which was in an early English library was a copy of Premierfait's translation, presented by the Earl of Warwick to that famous book-lover, Humphrey, Duke of Gloucester.²⁷ The latter does not seem to have included it in his gifts in 1439 and 1443 to the Public Library at Oxford, in which are found so many copies of Petrarch's and Boccaccio's Latin works,²⁸ as well as Serravalle's Latin translation of, and commentary on, the *Divina Commedia*.²⁹

¹³ *Res. mem.*, Lib. IV (*Opera*, 1581, 427). On popularity of the story, cf. Papanti, *Dante secondo la tradizione e i novellatori*, 94, 116, 132; R. Köhler, *l. c.* II, 642; Shakespeare, *Jest-Books*, ed. W. C. Hazlitt, Series I, 103.

¹⁴ O. Hecker, *Boccaccio-Funde*, 111 n.

¹⁵ L. Delisle, *Cabinet des manuscrits*, I, 41, III, 329; *Not. et Extr.*, XXXIV, 1, 273, 276-7. In copies in medieval English libraries, cf. *Collected Papers of H. Bradshaw*, 38, 54. Lydgate shows an acquaintance with it: *Prol.* to *Tragedies*; st. 37, 38; ed. Wayland, n. d. sig. A ii recto. A copy of it appears in an Oxford bookseller's accounts of 1510. E. G. Duff, *Library*, N. S. VIII, 259, 265. On popularity in Spain at the same period, cf. A. Farinelli, *l. c.*, 302-6, 308, 310.

¹⁶ Delisle, *Cab.*, III, 180.

¹⁷ de Nolhac, *Pétr. et L'humanisme*, 2d ed., II, 304.

¹⁸ Mullinger, *University of Cambridge*, I, 433.

¹⁹ J. O. Halliwell, *A Cat. of the Books Presented to C. C. College, Cam.* (A. D.) 1439, by T. Markaunt, 16. (Camb. Antiq. Soc. Misc. Communications, Part I.) This was probably the same copy noted in Bernard's *Cat.*

²⁰ G. E. Corrie, *Cat. of the Original Library of St. Catherine's Hall*. (Camb. Antiq. Soc., Publ. I.)

²¹ *Collectanea*, 2d ed., III, 18. This was perhaps already noted in the *Catalogue of the Library of Queen's College in 1472* (Cam. Antiq. Soc., Publ. xv), not accessible to me. In Balliol Leland also noted a copy of "Epistolae Francisci Petrarchae," *l. c.* 62. This was in all probability that in the collection left by William Grey in 1478 (Coxe, *Codd. Ball. Coll. in Cat. Codd. Mss. qui in Coll.*, etc.).

²² E. Bernard, *Catalogi libr. Mss. Angl. et Nib.* 1697, I, p. 68, (cf. *Cat. Codd. Mss. Bibl. Bodl.*, Pars II, H. O.

Coxe, p. 526); II, p. 73, (Coxe, *Codd. Magd. Coll.* 24 in *Cat. Codd. Mss. qui in Coll.*, etc.); III, p. 131; cf. Warton, *Hist. of Eng. Poetry*, 1840, II, 184.

²³ Mullinger, *l. c.* 249, n. 4.

²⁴ R. Köhler, *Kleinere Schriften*, I, 502-3, 534-5.

²⁵ H. Hauvette, *De Laurentio de Primofato*, 1903, 66.

²⁶ *Ib.*, 91. Premierfait, himself, in his laudatory Latin and French verses on Boccaccio, speaks of the Griselda story as a separate work from the *Decamerone*, and it is found in this condition only in the translation of Petrarch, P. Paris, *Les manuscrits françois de la Bibliothèque du roi*, I, 220, 251.

²⁷ Delisle, *Cabinet*, I, 52, n. 4; Hauvette, *l. c.*, 91, n. 1, 96, n. 2.

²⁸ H. Anstey, *Monumenta Academica*, 760, 761, 764, 770, 772.

²⁹ Hamilton, *Twentieth Annual Report of the Cambridge Dante Society*, 32-4.

CHAUCER'S "PETRAK."

Tatlock has confirmed Pollard's²⁹ recognition of the fact that according to the preponderance of manuscript evidence, Chaucer's spelling of the poet's name was "Petrak," but his further suggestion on the source of this spelling is hardly convincing. "It is well known that Petrarch's father was named Petracco, and that the poet's name would naturally have been Frances Petracchi. The earlier form of the name is, however (even at times in autograph), often found in Latin and Italian mss. of the fourteenth century, and must have been familiar" (159). Whatever the poet's name should have been theoretically, he wrote his name "Petrarca," with the variant "Petrarcha,"³⁰ and "Petrarca" is found in autograph manuscripts of his friends, Boccaccio³¹ and Coluccio Salutati,³² and of his executor, Lombardo della Seta.³³ Moreover, in his will he refers to his brother as "Gerardus Petrarchae,"³⁴ if his brother signs himself in Latin "Gerardus Petraccolli" or in Italian "Gerardo Petracollo,"³⁵ and he himself appears in official documents as "Francisci P[e]troquoli"³⁶ and as "Petrarquā."³⁷ No autograph manuscript of Petrarch's *Letteres* is known to Petrarch's scholars of the present day,³⁸ so one can not accept with Tatlock, Fracassetti's judgment on the authority of ms. B of the Bibliotheca Marciana, even if it should be identical with CL. XIII, 70, which has been shown by

de Nohac to be a collection of letters, made under the care, and with the corrections of Petrarch.³⁹ Fracassetti's statement that "Petracchi" is to be found in Italian manuscripts of the fourteenth century,⁴⁰ which he does not specify, can scarcely be accepted as authoritative against the mass of authentic evidence for "Petrarca." Tatlock (159, n. 3) has noted the spelling "Pétrac" in the *Menagier*; Jean Daudin, in his translation of the *De Remediis*, regularly writes "Petrach,"⁴¹ and the first publisher of this translation prints "Petracque."⁴² So that the spelling of the name was not peculiar to Chaucer, who if he had any precedent found it in a French version of Petrarch's story, a possibility which is by no means beyond proof.⁴³

None of Chaucer's successors seem to have followed him in spelling the poet's name incorrectly; Lydgate⁴⁴ writes "Petrarcke," the form used by Skelton,⁴⁵ while Gawain Douglas⁴⁶ and Barclay⁴⁷ wrote "Petrarche." If Henry Parker, Lord Morley, led astray by the chatter of the late Italian humanists,⁴⁸ wrote in an early unpublished work "Petrak" and "Petraccha,"⁴⁹ in his later published translations of the *Trionfi*,

²⁹ de Nohac, *Giorn. stor.*, XVIII, 439; *P. et l'hum.*, I, 99, n. 1, 111, n. 2, 114.

⁴⁰ *Lettere familiari*, I, 216, n.**

⁴¹ Delisle, *Not. et Extr.*, XXXIV, 1, 292, 295, 296. That he was translating a Latin ms. with the correct spelling is evidenced by his once writing "Petrarch," *ib.* 294.

⁴² *Ib.*, 289. Cf. Brunet, *Manuel du libr.*, 5th ed., IV, 567.

⁴³ The variants of the mss. Bibl. nat., 7403, 7568 noted by Pichon, *Menagier*, I, 99, as well, perhaps, as ms. St. Victor 853, and Brit. Mus. ms. Royal, 19, C VIII (de Montaiglon, *Le livre du Chevalier de la Tour Landry*, XI, xliii), may approach closer to Chaucer's version, in which the French forms of the name are so striking.

⁴⁴ *Tragedies*, I, c., *Minor Poems*, ed. Halliwell, p. ix.

⁴⁵ *Garlande of Laurell*, 379; *Phyllyp Sparows*, 758.

⁴⁶ Ed. J. Small, I, 35.

⁴⁷ *Ship of Fools*, ed. T. H. Jamieson, I, 9. For the source of passage in Locher's *Prologus* to his Latin translation, where one finds "Petrarcham," cf. E. Sulger-Gebing, *Zeit. f. vergl. Lit.*, VIII, 23.

⁴⁸ Cf. Fracassetti, *Lettere familiari*, I, 216, n.**

⁴⁹ In his *Preface*—addressed to Henry VIII—to his translation of Boccaccio's *De claris mulieribus*, cited in G. Waldron, *The Literary Museum; or the Ancient and Modern Repository*, London, 1792, pp. i-ii; cited in part by A. Hortis, *Studj sulle Opere latine del Boccaccio*, 665, n.

³⁰ de Nohac, *La bibliothèque de Fulvio Orsini*, p. 289, n. 3. In autograph mss. we find Boccaccio spelling his name "Boccaccius," "Boccaccius," "Bocchacius" and "Bocchaccius." Hecker, *Boccaccio-Funde*, 299, n. 3.

³¹ Hecker, *l. c.*, 298 and n. 6.

³² *Epistolario*, ed. Novati, c. g., I, 181; III, 84.

³³ de Nohac, *Not. et Extr.*, XXXIV, 1, 72.

³⁴ H. Cochin, *Le frère de Petrarche*, 148.

³⁵ *Ib.*, 223, 237; cf. 145. Cf. also Nicolaus "de Petrarcha," who lived in Naples at the end of the fourteenth century, possibly a son of Petrarch (de Nohac, *Giorn. stor.*, XVII, 146).

³⁶ *Ib.*, 197.

³⁷ *Ib.*, 223.

³⁸ de Nohac, *Petr. et l'hum.*, I, 112, n. 2. The Italian (!) letters printed in facsimile in Foscolo's *Essays on Petrarch*, cited by Tatlock, 159, n. 2, can hardly be considered seriously.

he writes "Petrarcke,"⁵⁰ and finally in Leland's works we find the familiar Latin form "Petrarcha."⁵¹

GEORGE L. HAMILTON.

University of Michigan.

THE SOURCE OF CHAPTER I OF
SEALSFIELD'S *LEBENSBLDER AUS*
DER WESTLICHEN HEMISPHERE.

I.

Professor Faust, on p. 47 of his Johns Hopkins dissertation, refers to a statement of Sealsfield to the effect that almost the whole of *Transatlantische Reiseskizzen* (i. e., *George Howard's Esq. Brautfahrt*) were published in English, in American newspapers during 1827-8, long before the German book appeared. Faust cites, as an instance (yet note the date), the sketch *A Night on the Banks of the Tennessee*, printed in the *New York Mirror*, Oct. 31 and Nov. 7, 1829. This sketch was afterward used as chapter II of *George Howard's Esq. Brautfahrt*.

I am not familiar with the above sweeping claim. In *Der Dichter beider Hemisphären*, p. 95, it dwindles to this: "Einige dieser Geschich-

ten waren ursprünglich englisch geschrieben und in amerikanischen Zeitungen veröffentlicht worden, hatten aber nicht viel Aufmerksamkeit erregt." This is evidently based on Sealsfield's autobiographic letter to Brockhaus, 21. June, 1854 (Hamburger, p. 52): . . . "Er hatte dieses Buch (viz.: *Transatlantische Reiseskizzen*), wie gesagt, in den Vereinigten Staaten bereits 1827 angefangen, im J. 1828 vollendet, einige Skizzen veröffentlicht, sie hatten aber nicht besonderen Anklang gefunden." Yet the number of the sketches actually published before the appearance of the book (in 1834) is narrowed down to a single one, in a passage of the introduction to *Der Legitime*, p. xiii of the 12^e edition . . . "Ferner erschienen von den transatlantischen Reiseskizzen *Die Nacht an den Ufern des Tennessee* (A Night on the Banks of the Tennessee), in dem New Yorker belletristischen Journale *The Mirror*; die übrigen, obwohl ursprünglich englisch niedergeschrieben, wurden zuerst von derselben Buchhandlung Orell und Füssli im Frühjahr 1834 und folglich als deutsche Originalwerke herausgegeben."

The incongruity or, to use the mildest term, indefiniteness of Sealsfield's voluntary intimations, is obvious. Nevertheless, they point the way to the seekers after the early writings of that puzzling author. It is, therefore, very surprising that the search for unidentified Sealsfield property in American newspapers and magazines has not been more exhaustive.

As one result of my own efforts in this field of work, I desire to call attention to a story in the *New York Mirror and Ladies' Literary Gazette* of Saturday, Nov. 7, 1829 (vol. VII, No. 18, pp. 141-142). The very title, *A Sketch from Life*, is suggestive. As a matter of fact, we have here the crude first form of chapter I of *George Howard's Esq. Brautfahrt*. The resemblance, better identity, of the plot is unmistakable. Even one of the names corresponds: Morland is the Moreland of *Siebzehn, achtundzwanzig und fünfzig, oder Szenen in New York*. The sketch is signed "Emily."

I would not, for the present, pass upon the question whether "Emily" is a pen-name of Sealsfield or whether the latter appropriated the material of another writer for his purposes. It is

⁵⁰ Hazlitt, *Hand-Book to Early English Literature*, 455. On date of publication—not before 1553—S. Lee, *D. N. B.*, XLIII, 239.

⁵¹ *Naenii in Mortem Thomasi Viati*, 1542, also in *Itinerary*, ed. 1745, II, xiii; cf. *Reliquiae Hearnianae*, ed. P. Bliss, I, 402; *Collectanea*, v, 141. The entry "Petrarchae quaedam" in Ritson's list of Lydgate's works (*Bibl. Poet.*, 80), noted by Tatlock (159, n. 6), has no earlier authority than the entry in Tanner's *Bibliotheca Britannico-Hibernica*, 1748, 492-3, a description of a manuscript in Trinity College Library, Cambridge, which Mr. W. Aldis Wright, then Librarian, could not identify in a search made in answer to an enquiry made for me by Professor C. E. Norton, a dozen years ago.

Before leaving the *Clerk's Tale* it may be noted that Schofield (*English Literature from the Norman Conquest to Chaucer*, 192-3) discusses the stories of Griselda and Fresne as if their themes were identical, although R. Köhler argued against the affinity of the two cycles (*Die Lais de Marie de France*, ed. 1885, lxvi-ii), drawing conclusions that were accepted by G. Paris (*Romania*, xxv, 611, n. 2).

well in this connection to quote from Sealsfield's letter to Cotta (1828) which accompanied the shipment of about fifteen separate contributions; of these (and others that were to follow) Sealsfield says: "Sie sind teils ganz von mir teils in der Übersetzung so verändert, dass sie füglich mein Eigentum genannt werden mögen." This not only throws light on our author's method of gathering material; for, more than that, there remains the possibility that some of the sketches enumerated in the same letter were worked into *Lebensbilder* and the other novels.

But, in justice to Sealsfield, it should also be stated that in no case could the relation of *Siebzehn, achtundzwanzig und fünfzig* to *A Sketch from Life* be characterized as a mere plagiarism. The treatment of the plain outlines is so original, the very story so thoroughly Sealsfieldian in its vivacity and immediacy of dialog and milieu that we may regard the English sketch as a legitimate source of the German.

As somewhat akin to the subject, I wish to mention Sealsfield's remark in the introduction to *Morton* (p. 19 of the 12^o ed.): "Zwei dieser Lebensbilder sind zuerst in einer amerikanischen Zeitschrift erschienen, und später in einer Londoner abgedruckt worden." Without having given specific attention to the sources of the American novels of Sealsfield, I would point out to special students of *Lebensbilder aus beiden Hemisphären* that the names of the persons prove Sealsfield's familiarity with the American "Unterhaltungs-Literatur" of the twenties. Cf. particularly *A Tale of the West-Indies*, anon., in the *Mirror*. The hero is named Morton.

OTTO HELLER.

Prague, *Bibliotheca Caesarea Regia*.

THE RULE OF THREE ACTORS IN FRENCH SIXTEENTH CENTURY TRAGEDY.

The familiar usage of the Greek stage which allowed only three actors besides mutes and members of the chorus was handed down to French

playwrights in a form modified by transmission through Seneca's academic drama. The practical advantages secured to the Greek dramatist by having only a limited number of actors to train had small weight with the Roman author, writing, as he did, for a reading rather than a theater-going public. Accordingly, we are not surprised to find that, while usually making only three characters appear on the stage at once, Seneca does occasionally so interpret the Greek rule as to allow four speaking actors, any three of whom may enter into conversation, provided the fourth remains temporarily silent.¹ Such treatment follows the Greek custom theoretically, but practically makes necessary at least four actors, none of whom are mutes, a usage unknown to extant Attic tragedy.

The two examples that can be cited from Seneca of his departure from the Greek usage will make his position clear. In *Oedipus*, Act II, Creon, after announcing to Oedipus the approach of Tiresias and Manto, becomes silent, leaving the conversation to the new-comers and Oedipus, but not quitting the stage till the chorus begins some hundred lines further on. A still clearer case is found in the last act of *Agamemnon*, where Cassandra is the silent witness of the conversation between Electra, Aegisthus, and Clytemnestra, but speaks as soon as Electra leaves the stage. Four actors are necessary in both of these cases, but three is the largest number engaged in a conversation. Seneca thus modifies slightly the Greek usage, doing so in a manner not inconsistent with Horace's dramatic precept,

... nec quarta loqui persona laboret.²

Now, no one will claim that either the Greek or the Senecan usage was observed in the French medieval drama.³ Furthermore, neither Hardy⁴ nor the seventeenth century classic dramatists⁵

¹ Cf. Henri Weil, *Revue archéologique*, 1865, I, pp. 21-35, who comes to the same conclusions from a different point of view.

² *Ars poetica*, 192.

³ Cf. *Le Mystère du Viel Testament*, 441, seq.; *La Femme du roy de Portugal*, 20, seq.

⁴ Cf. *Scedase*, III, 2; *Mariamne*, v; *Meleagre*, II, 2.

⁵ Cf. Mairat, *Sophonisbe*, II, 3; III, 4; v, 5; Corneille, *Le Cid*, IV, 5; *Horace*, II, 6; *Héraclius*, v, 3; *Pompée*, I, 1; Racine, *Andromaque*, III, 6; *Athalie*, II, 7.

limited themselves to three interlocutors. So strict a classicist as d'Aubignac, indeed, expressly permits the violation of the ancient custom.⁶ There remains to be considered, however, the French classic tragedies of the sixteenth century, known to follow most closely their Greek and Latin models. If they can be shown to have imitated the Greek usage and to have done so after the manner of Seneca, another indication will be furnished of the academic nature and purpose of these French plays, their dependence upon the Greeks and especially upon Seneca.

The standard sources of information as to French sixteenth century tragedy are largely silent in regard to the rule of three actors. I have been able to find a discussion of the matter only in *Robert Garnier und die Antike Tragödie*⁷ by Oscar Mysing, whose views are of no great value in this connection, since he asserts that the law of the three actors "sich auch bei Seneca durchweg bewahrt findet," and consequently is persuaded that Garnier is violating the rule when he is following Seneca's usage. Mysing takes up examples from Garnier's *M. Antoine*, which are examined below. His original investigation applies to this author only, but he states that the rule "wurde von den Kunstrichtern der Renaissance gleichfalls als Regel aufgestellt," quoting from Vauquelin,

"Et ne parle vn quatriesme en l'Etage avec trois :
Trois parlant seulement suffisent à la fois."⁸

Although this translation of the line already quoted from Horace is of decided interest, its occurrence does not prove that the rule of three interlocutors was observed by the French dramatists of the sixteenth century, since they cannot be presumed to have followed the advice of any contemporary critic, certainly not that of Vauquelin, writing, as he did, in 1597, after most of the dramatists had ceased to compose. It is true that the principle enunciated in Vauquelin's passage agreed with contemporary usage, but if we wish to be certain of the rules followed by French dramatists, we cannot rely upon this statement

only, but must make an examination of the plays themselves.

In order to determine the French usage, therefore, I have examined all the tragedies of the period in question that were accessible to me in this country. The list is not exhaustive, but, as it contains nineteen tragedies, including all that have come down from Jodelle, Garnier, and Montchrestien, I believe that it is long enough to show what rule was followed at the time. If the great majority of these plays are found to keep the Greek rule, or Seneca's modification of it, such uniformity can scarcely be due to chance, but seems rather to result from the fact that three was the largest number of interlocutors allowed by these French classicists, and that any play which introduced a fourth interlocutor abandoned in that respect its classic technique and approached the usage of the contemporary irregular drama.

The tragedies examined are the following: Beza, *Abraham sacrificant* (1550); Jodelle, *Cleopatra captive* (1552), *Didon se sacrificant* (1560); Melin de Saint-Gelais, *Sophonisba* (1555); Grevin, *Cesar* (1560)⁹; Bounin, *La Soltane* (1561); Garnier, *Porcie* (1568), *Hippolyte* (1573), *Cornelie* (1574), *M. Antoine* (1578), *La Troade* (1579), *Antigone* (1580), *Les Juifves* (1583); Montchrestien, *Sophonisbe* (1596, republished in 1601 as *La Carthaginoise*), *L'Escossoise* (1601), *Les Lacènes* (1601), *Aman* (1601), *David* (1601), *Hector* (1604). It has been found that, besides the chorus and mutes, two actors, who could take different parts at different times, would suffice for *Cornelie*, *L'Escossoise*, and *David*; that *Didon*, *Cesar*, *La Soltane*, *La Troade*, *M. Antoine*,¹⁰ *Hector*, *Aman*, and *Les Lacènes* require four; while three are sufficient for the other plays mentioned. Thus it appears that the strictly Greek usage is not infrequently violated. It is pertinent to inquire, however, whether Seneca's modification of the Greek custom is also violated, whether the French abandoned the rule of three interlocutors,

⁹ Grevin's usage agrees with that of Muret in his *Julius Cesar*, the Latin original of the former's tragedy.

¹⁰ Four actors are here sufficient, for the *enfants de Cleopatre* are considered as mutes, saying only, "Adieu, Madame," and "Allons." These interpellations are too insignificant to allow the children who make them to be seriously considered as speaking actors.

⁶ See Arnaud, *Théories dramatiques*, 246-7, Paris, 1888.

⁷ Leipzig dissertation, 1891.

⁸ *L'Art poétique*, II, 465-466.

just as they required more than three actors. To answer such inquiry I shall consider individually the eight tragedies which make necessary the fourth player.

At the close of a conversation in *Didon* between Ascaigne, Palinure, and Achate, the speakers note the approach of Enée, who begins to soliloquize as soon as they are silent. The rapidity of this change renders it unlikely that the same actor played more than one of the four rôles, so that four players seem necessary, although there are not more than three who speak together. In *Cesar*, Act III, Calpurnie converses with her nurse, then with Cesar and Decime Brute, then with the nurse again. Apparently the nurse does not leave the stage; she certainly has nothing to say as long as the two men are present. We have, therefore, four actors, of whom only three engage in conversation at a time. Later dramatists would have divided this act into three scenes, but at this time such divisions are seldom made. Again, the fifth act of *La Soltane* presents eunuchs whose spokesman converses with Moustapha and the Sophe, but has nothing to say when the Soltan enters, even when addressed by the latter. In *La Troade*, Act II, Helen, Andromache, Astyanax, and Ulysse are each represented by an actor, but only three unite in conversation, for Helen ceases to speak as soon as she has called attention to the approach of Ulysse.

Now Mysing correctly notes that "in M. Antoine müssen in der Szene zwischen Cleopatre, Eras, Charmion, Diomede vier Schauspieler nötig sein (V. 665-685), ebenso in der Schlusszene dieser Tragödie, wo Cleopatre, Euftron, Charmion, Eras gleichzeitig auf der Bühne sind." He fails to perceive, however, that this is no violation of Seneca's usage, for, in the first case, Cleopatre finishes her conversation with Eras and Charmion before turning to Diomede, who has previously said nothing and had nothing said to him. He replies to Cleopatre, but the other women do not speak again. It seems probable that Diomede does not enter till after Cleopatre has finished her conversation with the women, for his presence has not been remarked up to that time. The absence of stage-directions prevents this fact from being obvious. The second case mentioned by Mysing is clearly not contrary to Seneca, for Charmion

has nothing to say till Euftron has left the stage.

A similar situation is found in the fourth act of *Hector*, where Hecube becomes silent upon the arrival of Antenor, allowing the conversation to be carried on by Priam, Andromache, and the last arrival. The same thing occurs in the fifth act with the rôles changed, for there Andromache leaves the conversation to Priam, Hecube, and the messenger. The fourth act of *Aman* requires more than three actors, but only three converse together.

It is clear that in all the cases mentioned there is nothing opposed to Seneca's usage, for more than three actors are needed in the plays, but more than three do not converse together, a fact that would be more readily apparent if the scene divisions were marked and the stage-directions given. There is, however, a solitary violation of the rule in the third act of *Les Lacèdènes*, where Cratesiclea converses with Leonidas, Agis, and Pausanias. This is a comparatively late play and may have been influenced by the success of Hardy's irregular dramas. Its failure to conform in a single instance is not sufficient to break down the proof offered by eighteen plays of the existence of the rule. My examination of the tragedies shows, therefore, that the Greek usage holds for ten plays, the Senecan modification of it for eight, and that only one play allows the fourth interlocutor. These conclusions, of course, indicate that Seneca's influence was paramount rather than that of the Greeks, for, as the majority of his plays follow the Greek usage, it was possible for a French playwright to adhere to the Greek rule, though imitating Seneca alone, while one who introduced a fourth actor, but had never more than three interlocutors, departed from Greek usage, though still adhering to Seneca.

A few other facts may be cited to show that the French obedience to the Greek rule or Seneca's modification of it was not mere chance. Garnier, who observes the rule in all his tragedies, violates it in his tragi-comedy, *Bradamante*,¹¹ just as Hardy did later in his works of the same genre.¹²

¹¹ IV, 5 and V, 4 and 5.

¹² Cf. *Ariadne*, v, last scene; *Cornélie*, iv, 4; *Arsacome*, i, 2.

Such usage can scarcely be a mere coincidence. Again, cases occur in which two or more characters are treated as one, apparently to avoid the dividing of the conversation among four. Thus the eunuchs in *La Soltane* speak together, that is, one probably speaks while the others remain mute. So, too, in the fourth and fifth acts of *Les Juives* the wives of Zedekiah discourse frequently and at length, but always in unison, so that only one speaking actor would be required for the two rôles and only three interlocutors would be employed. As it would add dramatic interest to individualize the queens by dividing their rôles, Garnier's failure to do so in his masterpiece points to the fact that he was fettered in this respect by an academic convention.¹³

A further indication that the number of interlocutors was intentionally limited to three is found in the fifth act of *Hector*, where a messenger comes to describe the hero's death to Priam, Hecube, and Andromache. As the messenger approaches, Andromache faints and the chorus cries:

"Retirons la, mes sœurs, dedans ceste maison.
Cela vient à propos afin qu'elle n'escoute
Ce message de mort que tant elle redoute."

But as Andromache reappears after the messenger has ceased speaking and laments Hector's death at length, the author does not appear to have had her removed from the stage merely to avoid showing us her grief. Had he allowed her to remain, she must have joined Priam and Hecube in questioning the messenger, thus making four interlocutors. Her retirement to the house is "à propos," not to avoid the expression of emotion, which is the soul of sixteenth century tragedy, but to enable Montchrestien to adhere to the academic tradition that forbade a conversation in which four actors took part.

¹³ It may be argued that Garnier makes his ambassadors speak as one man in *Bradamante*, where the law of three interlocutors is freely violated, and that therefore the manner in which the queens speak in *Les Juives* is no proof of the observance of the law, but it must be noted that these ambassadors are introduced merely to bring about the dénouement, so that nothing is to be gained by their differentiation. The case of the queens, moreover, is not cited as absolute proof of the existence of the law, but merely as tending to confirm facts already stated in regard to it.

The evidence stated convinces me that the Senecan usage was law in French sixteenth century tragedy, but, before concluding, I desire to mention briefly the position of certain theorists in regard to this point of dramatic technique. Aristotle had mentioned in the fourth chapter of his *Poetics* that Sophocles was the introducer of the third actor, a statement repeated by Diogenes Laertius¹⁴ and Suidas.¹⁵ As none of these expressly prohibited the introduction of a fourth actor, it is upon Horace¹⁶ that the burden of the responsibility falls, for even if he did not intend to formulate a law, he expressed himself in a manner that could be readily interpreted as forbidding at least a fourth interlocutor. Among Italians Castelvetro, who is important in French dramatic history as the first formulator of the rule of the three unities, not only says nothing of Horace's precept, but completely misunderstands the statements of Aristotle and Diogenes Laertius concerning the introduction of the third actor by Sophocles. He declares that they meant that "Sophocle operò che i contrafacitori fossero tre, cio è tre maniere, vna de' ballatori, vn'altra de' cantori, e vn'altra de' sonatori, doue prima per Thespi non erano se non vna, che conteneua ballatori, cantori, e sonatori insieme, e per Eschilo due, cio è vna che conteneua ballatori soli, e vna'altra, che conteneua cantori, e sonatori insieme."¹⁷ Evidently a law of three actors means nothing to him.

Among French theorists Du Bellay does not descend to dramatic detail in his *Defense et Illustration*. His friend Ronsard, more definite than he in other matters, says nothing about the number of actors. Scaliger lays down no law as to the usage in tragedy, but he seems to be acquainted with Horace's direction, for, in speaking of another dramatic form, he declares, "Omne personarum genus introducere licet. Quatuor etiam in eadem Scena loqui, nulla religio est."¹⁸ Jean de la Taille leaves minutiae to Aristotle and

¹⁴ *Life of Plato*, xxxiv.

¹⁵ In his *Lexicon*.

¹⁶ See the quotation from his *Ars poetica* at the beginning of this article.

¹⁷ *Poetica d'Aristotele vulgarizzata et sposta*, p. 87, edition of Bäle, 1576.

¹⁸ *Poetices*, III, cap. xcvi.

Horace, for "ie serois trop long à deduire par le menu ce propos que ce grand Aristote en ses Poëtiques, et apres luy Horace (mais non avec telle subtilité) ont continué plus amplement et mieux que moy."¹⁹ Vauquelin de la Fresnaye, as quoted above, gives a clear statement of the rule, which he translates directly from Horace. As he wrote too late to influence most of the writers of tragedy in the sixteenth century, his lines are of value chiefly in showing the trend of contemporary thought and confirming facts established by examination of the plays.

This comparative neglect by critics of a rule which dramatists were careful to observe goes to show that the sixteenth century theorists did not lead the poets and that, when the two agree, it is rather because both go back to the same source than because the former's rules were followed by the latter. References to Horace by Ronsard and la Taille, taken in connection with Vauquelin's translation of his *Ars poetica*, indicate his influence upon those interested in the drama. It is undoubtedly from him that the dramatists derived the formal rule of three interlocutors, which they found illustrated by Seneca's plays.

To sum up briefly, I conclude that the Greek rule of three actors was interpreted by the French to mean three interlocutors, according to their understanding of Horace's precept and Seneca's usage; that the rule, thus modified, was carried out by the chief writers of French sixteenth century tragedy, by Beza, Jodelle, Saint-Gelais, Grevin, Bounin, Garnier; that Montchrestien violated it only once; that such usage is another indication of the academic nature of the French *genre* and of Seneca's powerful influence upon it; and that in this matter the sixteenth century dramatists followed the Latin masters directly, rather than the theorists of their own day.

H. CARRINGTON LANCASTER.

Amherst College.

THE FAERIE QUEENE AND AMIS AND AMILOUN.

Embedded in the structure of the *Faerie Queene* are fragments of the medieval romances which present something of the curious interest of the bits of Roman wall and the like, here and there appearing in the foundations of some noble cathedral. The business of identifying the *disjecta membra* of these earlier, less pretentious poets, though something has been done,¹ is as yet by no means complete. No apology, therefore, is necessary in putting on record a somewhat obvious identification of this sort, hitherto unnoted in print; especially since the parallel proposed is of sufficient extent to illustrate Spenser's method of incorporating in his own the work of the elder romancers.

To summarize briefly parts of the 7th, 8th, and 9th cantos of the *Faerie Queene*, Book IV: Amoret, in the cave of the giant Lust, learns from her fellow prisoner, Aemylia, how she, keeping tryst with her lover, the Squire of Low Degree, with whom she had arranged "away to flit," found in his stead "the Carle of hellish kind," Lust, who has since confined her in his cave; whence they are all rescued later by Belphebe

Arthur slays the basilisk-eyed monster Corflambo, who is in pursuit of a squire holding a dwarf before him on his horse. From the squire—Placidus—he learns Aemylias' fate and also the fact that the Squire of Low Degree, when he arrived at the tryst, met there this giant Corflambo, who cast him into his dungeon. Here

¹ Thomas Warton, *Observations on the Faerie Queene*, 2nd ed., London, 1762, I, § 2: "Of Spenser's Imitations from Old Romances."

M. Walther, *Malory's Einfluss auf Spenser's Faerie Queene*. Heidelberg diss. Eisleben, 1898.

J. B. Fletcher, "Huon of Bordeaux and the Faerie Queene." *Journal of Germanic Philology*, II, pp. 203-112.

J. R. Macarthur, "The Influence of Huon of Bordeaux upon the Faerie Queene." *Journal of Germanic Philology*, IV, pp. 215-238.

E. K. Broadus, "The Red Cross Knight and Lybeaus Desconus." *Mod. Lang. Notes*, XVIII, p. 202 f.

J. J. Jusserand, *Literary History of the English People*, New York, 1906, vol. II, p. 495, mentions a parallel between Britomart's innamoramento and an incident in Ortuñez de Calahorra's *Espejo de Principes*, etc., 1562.

¹⁹ *L'Art de la Tragedie*, 3b.

he was discovered by the giant's fair daughter Poëana :

'To whom she did her liking lightly cast,
And wooed him her paramour to bee :
From day to day she woo'd and prayd him fast,
And for his love him promist libertie at last.

He, though affide unto a former love,
To whom his faith he firmly ment to hold,
Yet seeing not how thence he mote remove,
But by that meanes which fortune did unfold,
Her graunted love, but with affection cold,
To win her grace his libertie to get.'

(iv, viij, 52-53.)

He succeeded in finding favor so far as to be allowed to walk about the garden under the eye of a dwarf. Placidus, hearing of his friend's imprisonment, lurked about the place until he was apprehended by the dwarf,

'For me he did mistake that Squire to bee,
For never two so like did living creature see.'

(iv, viij, 55.)

The supposed squire was remanded to prison for attempting to escape, where he found his friend,

'But him the more agreev'd I found thereby :
For all his joy, he said, in that distresse
Was mine and his Aemylias libertie.
Aemylia well he lov'd, as I mote ghesse,
Yet greater love to me then her he did professe.'

(iv, viij, 57.)

Placidus then explained to him how he might preserve his fidelity to his lady by letting him, Placidus, take his place in Poëana's ardent affections. This plan was put into operation with such success that Poëana again granted her supposed Squire scope to walk at large. On one of his outings, Placidus picked up the dwarf and fled, pursued by the giant, the predicament from which Arthur rescued him

At the end of this recital Arthur gains entrance to the giant's castle by a ruse, enlarges among others the Squire of Low Degree, who falls into Aemylia's arms, and, by the mildness of his presence, reforms Poëana into a suitable wife for Placidus.

The name of the Squire of Low Degree, Amyas, (iv, viij, 59, 63), and Aemylia, that of his lady,

suggest at once the romance of *Amis and Amiloun*,² which shows further several points of similarity with our story.

(1.) *The indistinguishable likeness of Amis nad Amiloun.*

In al þe court was þer no wigt,
Erl, baron, swain no knigt,
Neither lef ne loþe,
So lyche were þai boþe of sigt
And of on waxing, ypligt,
I tel gow for soþe,
In al þing þey were so liche,
þer was neþer pouer no riche,
Who so beheld hem boþe,
Fader ne moder þat coupe sain,
þat knew þe hendi children tvain,
But by þe coloure of her cloþe.

(ll. 85-96 ; cf. *Amis e Amilun*, ll. 25-30.)

(2.) *Their perfect friendship.*

So wele þo children loued hem þo,
Nas neuer children, loued hem so,
Noþer in word no in dede.
Bitvix hem tvai, of blod & bon,
Trewer loue nas neuer non,
In gest as so we rede.
(ll. 139-144 ; cf. *Amis e Amilun*, ll. 1-25.)

² I quote from the Middle English version of the romance as printed by Kölbing, *Altenglische Bibliothek*, 2. Band, Heilbronn, 1884, with line references to the French text in the same volume. These forms seem to stand closest to that in which Spenser knew the story. The Latin prose version (Kölbing, p. xcvii f.), tells of no wooing lady and reluctant lover : 'Comes vero Amelius super regis filiam oculos iniecit et eam quam cito potuit oppressit.' Almost as ardent is the Miles of the numerous French prose versions printed during the sixteenth century. I quote from the earliest, that of Anthoine Verard, Paris, circ. 1503. Miles has chosen Bellissant as his partner : 'Mais Miles qui se fetoit goy et iolyz et estoit amoureux luy va estraindre les dois si ferme quelle se ecria et luy dist fire tenez vous coy vous me blecez. Quāt miles lout crier si fut faiy damours et se fentit feru de ceste maladie et puy luy marcha sur le pied qui nous signifie que le feu se alume' (f. xlvio). The lady returns his affection and, as he is about to start on a military expedition, summons him to her chamber, and blames him. 'Car deuant les gens mauez mōtre signe damour et que me voulez aymer cha/cun le vit clerement. Mais cest sans raifon. Car ie vous prometiz que talent nen ay' (xliv. v°). Miles pleads as his excuse her exceeding loveliness, and in response to his plea for mercy she says : 'Mais se me voulez iurer sur le corps nōtre seigneur q̄ vous me prēdrez a femme par honneur ie vo' iueray au/ si que iamais nauray aultre seigūr que vous et vous garderay loyaulment mon

(3.) *The wooing lady, Belisaunt.*

To sir Amis sche made hir mon
 & seyde opun hir play :
 "Sir knigt, on þe mine hert is brougt,
 þe to loue is al mi þougt
 Boþe bi nigȝt & day,
 þat bot þou wolt mi leman be,
 Ywis, min hert brekeþ a þre,
 No lenger libben y no may !"
 (ll. 569-576 ; cf. *Amis e Amilun*, ll. 251-262.)

(4.) *The reluctant young man, Amis.*

þan stode þat hendy knigt ful stille,
 & in his hert him liked ille,
 No word no spak he þo ;
 He þougt : Bot y graunt hir wille,
 Wiþ hir speche sche wil me spille.
 (ll. 637-641.)

Lop him was, þat dede to don,
 & wele loþer, his liif forgon ;
 Was him neuer so wo.
 & þan he þougt, wiþ outen lesing,
 Better were, to graunt hir asking,
 þan his liif for to spille.
 (ll. 646-651 ; cf. *Amis e Amilun*, ll. 262-307.)

amour. Belle respond miles grant folie feroye fe ie vous
 refluoye : plain feroye de grant traïson : car plus belle ne
 plus meilleur ne pourroye auoir de vous. Ainfi je con
 fentirent en vne fi bonne et ferme amour . . . (f. xlii^{vo}).
 On Miles' return, Bellisant visits him in the night, but the
 lover on this occasion displays not even so much hesitation
 as in the corresponding scene in the *Chanson de Geste*.
 (*Amis et Amiles und Jourdain de Blaivies*, herausg. v. Kon-
 rad Hofmann, 2^{te} aufl., Erlangen, 1882, ll. 623-693). The
Bibliothèque Bleue of Alfred Delvau, Paris, 1859-62, gives
 the story in substantially the form, save for modernizations
 in language, of the early French prints. For a partial list
 of them, see L. Gautier, *Bibliographie des Chansons de*
Geste, Paris, 1897, p. 52. The foregoing extracts suffi-
 ciently show that they stand further from Spenser than the
 Middle English form, especially in the name Miles (or
 Milles) and in that young man's more coming-on dis-
 position.

I have not been able to find the Italian editions, Venice,
 1503, Milan, 1513, 1530 (Gautier, *loc. cit.*). They prob-
 ably do not differ from the French prose ('Eine italien-
 ische Übersetzung des gedruckten französischen Volks-
 buches,' Hofmann, *op. cit.*, p. v).

The version in Latin elegiacs of Radulfus Tortarius
 (printed by Hofmann, *op. cit.*, xxiv-xxx), leads us to
 infer possibly that the lady may have done the wooing but
 give no hint of reluctance on the part of Amelius.

My object is not so much to find a definite source for
 Spenser's narrative as to select for purposes of comparison
 the one among many versions of the story which stands
 nearest to the form in which he seems to have known it.

(5.) *The substitution of one friend for the other.*

Amiloun takes his friend's place in the trial by combat,
 while Amis lies beside Amiloun's wife—a sword between
 them. (ll. 973-1452.)

These correspondences are of themselves, I
 think, sufficient to show that Spenser has incor-
 porated in his narrative parts of the story of the
 ideal friends of the Middle Ages. The similarity
 of names places it beyond a peradventure.

Let us now presume to trace out his footing so
 far as the scent holds. Suppose we adopt the
 suggestion that Aemylia's ill-starred elopement is
 modelled on that of Isabella's in the twelfth and
 thirteenth cantos of the *Orlando Furioso*.³ Spen-
 ser, his imagination now started, proposes to write
 the counterpart of this story—that of a *young man*
 frustrated from keeping a tryst. A brain crammed
 with romances at once suggests that the young
 man who was captured while endeavoring to keep
 a tryst was the Squire of Low Degree.⁴ Now the
 true counterpart to the giant Lust, who has
 characteristically been substituted for Ariosto's
 "turba," as the jailor of Aemylia, would be a
 lustful lady. This, we may say, reminds him of
 the situation in the well-known romance of *Amis*
 and *Amiloun*, where Belisaunt woos the reluctant
 Amis. At this point his mind leaps to the famous
 pair of friends and from their adventures he adopts
 the *substitution* of one for the other as a means of
 resolving his story. This *dénouement* does not
 come in very aptly ; one fancies it were wiser of
 Placidus to seek Arthur immediately on learning
 of his friend's danger instead of thrusting himself
 into the same prison with the risk of depriving
 himself of all power to aid ; furthermore, the op-
 portunity for escape, of which Placidus success-
 fully availed himself, lay equally at the disposal
 of Amyas. But, apt or inapt, Spenser's head-
 long imagination refuses to discard so promising
 an incident as the substitution of one friend for
 his double, once it is laid hold on. Nothing re-

³ R. E. Neill Dodge, "Spenser's Imitations from
 Ariosto," *Pub. Mod. Lang. Assn.*, xii (1897), p. 202.

⁴ As Warton remarks (Vol. II, p. 183), 'Squire of
 Low Degree' "seems to have been a phrase commonly
 known and used about this time." See the edition of the
 romance in the Albion Series by W. E. Mead, Boston,
 1904 (pp. xi-xii), for instances of its use. I would
 simply give its application to Amyas some point.

mains but to point a moral—the reforming effects of magnanimity upon inordinate passion; Poëana, thus transformed, pairs off with the unattached Placidus; and the story is done.

The processes sketched above accord, at least, with what we may elsewhere infer concerning Spenser's method of composition. His impetuous fancy is no respecter of stories as such; he tears a venerable romance to pieces for the sake of a few incidents; he appropriates a name from another; the rest may go. He rechristens personages⁵ he alters or loses the course of narrative in his eagerness for the pictorial; but amid all this prodigality of appropriation and rejection that has gone to the illustration of the *Faerie Queene*, it is not unilluminating to observe, where it may be done, "th' accesse of that celestiall thiefe."

HARRY MORGAN AYRES.

Harvard University.

A CURIOUS MISTAKE IN FREYTAG'S *DIE JOURNALISTEN*.

While looking through one of the annotated American editions of Freytag's *Die Journalisten* the other day, I came upon a passage which for a time puzzled me. I shall first give the reading, reserving my comment until later.

In the famous second scene of act two, where Schmock and Bolz are conversing at the entertainment which is given for the purpose of gaining votes for the approaching election, I read in the American edition in question as follows:

'Bolz. Was verlangen Sie von uns, Sklave Roms? Wir sollten Sie Ihrer Partei entziehen? Nimmermehr! Wir sollten Ihren politischen Überzeugungen Gewalt anthun? Sie zum Abtrünnigen machen? Wir sollten die Schuld tragen,

⁵ The name Placidus would, of course, be familiar to him, if not from the Golden Legend, from *The Worthie Hystorie of the moste Noble and Valiaunt Knight, Plasidas, etc. Gathered in English verse by Iohn Partridge, in the yere of our Lord, 1566*. Printed for the Roxburghe Club, London, 1873.

I am at a loss as to the name Poëana.

dass Sie zu unserer Partei kämen? Niemals! Unser Gewissen ist zart, es empört sich gegen Ihren Vorschlag.

Schmock. Wozu machen Sie sich Sorgen um das? Ich habe bei dem Blumenberg gelernt, in allen Richtungen zu schreiben. Ich habe geschrieben links, und wieder rechts. Ich kann schreiben nach jeder Richtung.

Bolz. Ich sehe, Sie haben Charakter. *Ihnen kann's in unserer Zeitung nicht fehlen*. Ihr Anerbieten ehrt uns, aber wir können es jetzt nicht annehmen. Eine so welterschütternde Begebenheit, wie Ihr Übertritt, will reiflich erwogen sein.'

I have italicized the passage which troubled me. I asked myself what could be the meaning of the sentence: 'Ihnen kann's in unserer Zeitung nicht fehlen,' or more particularly, what could Freytag in this connection have meant by the phrase 'in unserer Zeitung?' Failing to solve the difficulty as it stood, I began to suspect a typographical error somewhere. Perhaps, I suggested to myself, the author wrote or intended to write '*an* unserer Zeitung' instead of '*in* unserer Zeitung,' but I then noticed that even this proposed change with the meaning which attaches to those three words would, quite aside from the situation itself, be forbidden by the very next sentence: 'Ihr Anerbieten ehrt uns, aber wir können es jetzt nicht annehmen.' Furthermore, the whole situation would seem to preclude such a construction. Still clinging to the theory of a typographical error, I found that the only other possibility of such an error lay in the noun 'Zeitung.' This changed to 'Zeit' would at once solve all difficulty both for the sentence considered by itself and also if taken in connection with what immediately precedes and what immediately follows. The passage would then read 'Ihnen, kann's in unserer Zeit nicht fehlen,'—a journalist's clever thrust at the journalism of his time. This reading I then compared with the German edition of Freytag's *Dramatische Werke*, Band 2, Leipzig, S. Hirzel, 1890, and was gratified to find my position confirmed there. The American editor does not state upon what edition of the play he based his text, and as the older German editions are not accessible to me here, I am unable to trace the error to its source. This I regret the more, as I have since discovered to my surprise that *five other* annotated editions of

Die Journalisten give the reading 'Zeitung,' so that the difficulty seems to have escaped the attention of at least six editors of the play, if not more.

C. H. IBERSHOFF.

Cornell University.

SOME UNPUBLISHED NOTES OF LORD MACAULAY.

I.

On April 14, 1713, the initial performance of Addison's *Cato* was given at the Drury Lane theatre. Cibber states that he had read four acts of the play as early as 1703, and that he had desired to produce it at that time, but Addison's diffidence and his fear of failure deterred him from submitting his tragedy to the verdict of the public and it was only at the insistence of his friends that he finally allowed the tragedy to be presented.¹ The names of these friends we do not know, but they were undoubtedly Whig leaders, for with the actors and managers of his day Addison was not on intimate terms, and moreover many of his *Tatler* and *Spectator* papers on the theatre are marked by the severe strictures they contain on the lack of art and the low moral tone of the London stage. The town was not far wrong when it decided that the production of *Cato* was in part dictated by political considerations, and that the tragedy was in substance a stage sermon on liberty, a liberty which would be lost, the Whigs believed, if the Tory principles prevailed.

The Tories managed their case with characteristic cleverness. Instead of hissing the play as a Whig production, they applauded it roundly, and Bolingbroke calling to his box Barton Boothe, who took the rôle of Cato, presented him with a purse of fifty guineas for defending liberty against a perpetual dictator, obviously meaning that Cæsar, the opponent of liberty, resembled the Duke of Marlborough, the idol of the Whigs. As if to answer this, keys to the play were published in which the reader is informed that not Cæsar but

the heroic Cato represents the Duke of Marlborough "famous for his success in war but also for his admirable sedateness and presence of mind in time of battle." In a *Prologue to Cato* (1717) Thomas Fitzgerald well expressed the situation:

'Twas worth remark with how much heat and rage,
When first our Cato graced the British stage,
Contending parties all his words applied,
And strove to lift the patriot on their side;
Nay, by how natural an application
He chimed with every faction of the nation.
Of Freedom he asserts the glorious cause;
Straight rung the theatre with Whig applause.
Short joy! for in ten lines he changed the story,
And ranted like a hot tantivy Tory:
Fiercely exclaimed, from Generals for life,
From standing legions springs our civil strife.

Not only was Addison favoured with the applause of both parties, but he was most fortunate in the actors who interpreted his lines. *Cato* was played by Barton Boothe, a tragedian gifted with a superb stage presence and endowed with poetic imagination; the rôle of Marcia, Cato's daughter, was taken by Nance Oldfield, the most popular actress of the day; while Cibber, Wilks, and Powell were cast for important parts. It is not surprising that *Cato*, though produced at the end of the season, ran for thirty-five nights. In June the company visited Oxford, and Cibber in his *Apology* gives a most interesting account of the enthusiastic reception of the play by the undergraduates who crowded the house for three performances, for he observes that at this University town "A great deal of that false, flashy wit, and forced humour, which has been the delight of our Metropolitan multitude, was only rated at its bare, intrinsic value. Applause was not to be purchased there but by the true sterling, the *Sal Atticum* of a Genius. Shakespear and Jonson had there a sort of Classical authority."² Evidently the undergraduate taste has changed.

Cato, then, is to be regarded as one of the most striking successes of the eighteenth century drama. In twelve years it ran through eleven editions, it was the first English play to be translated into both French and Italian, and Voltaire but echoed the popular opinion in his well known statement that "the first English writer who

¹An *Apology for the Life of Mr. Colley Cibber*, chapter xiv.

²Chapter xiv.

composed a regular tragedy and infused a spirit of elegance through every part of it was the illustrious Mr. Addison."

II.

In 1835 Macaulay was in Calcutta, President of the Committee on Public Instruction and President of the Law Commission appointed to frame a criminal code for India; and though he took up this arduous work with characteristic energy, he still found time for his reading. In the British Museum is a three volume edition of *The Miscellaneous Works in Verse and Prose of the Late Right Honourable Joseph Addison, Esq.*, London, 1766, which Macaulay read at this time; the exact dates which he jotted down being May 27th and 28th, 1835. On the margins of this edition he has made, as was his custom, many notes in pencil which are now so faded and illegible that it is somewhat difficult to decipher them. So far as I can ascertain, these notes have escaped observation, though the Museum catalogue calls attention to them. In George Birkbeck Hill's edition of Johnson's *Lives of the Poets*, three of the notes are given, under the *Life of Addison*, but these do not concern *Cato*.³ Sir George Otto Trevelyan, in answer to my inquiry as to whether these notes had been printed, could send me no information on the subject. As showing Macaulay's unbiassed opinion of the tragedy, they are of interest and I give them as I transcribed them.

When he made these comments, Macaulay was in a mood to be favourably impressed by Addison's writings, for at the end of the *Drummer*, which he read the same day as *Cato*, he has this curious bit of eulogy. "I admire this comedy extremely. It is Addison's all over—full of delicate humour and amiable feeling. The fun is never coarse, the sentimental passages are never ranting or mawkish. I am convinced that if he had cultivated his talent for the drama he would have surpassed any Comedy writer since the days of James the First. I like this play far better than any of Congreve's, Sheridan's, Farquhar's, or Vanbrugh's. An odd taste, perhaps. But so it is." With such a valuation of Addison's dramatic gifts, we turn to *Cato*.

³ Vol. II, pp. 106-107.

The tragedy opens with a dialogue between Cato's sons, Marcus and Portius (both in love with Lucia), in which Marcus, among other matters, informs his brother that

Passion unpitied, and successful love
Plant daggers in my heart, and aggravate
My other griefs. Were but my Lucia kind!

Against this passage Macaulay has written the brief but expressive word "Bah!" A few lines further in this scene Portius points out Juba, a Numidian chief:

Behold yon Juba . . .
He loves our sister Marcia, greatly loves her.

The comment on these lines runs: "Unnatural. A Roman noble would as soon have thought of marrying his sister to a Moorish horse as to a Moorish Prince!" At the end of scene three is the comment: "Dennis's criticisms have a good deal of truth in them." After scene four is written: "The style is not easy enough for the drama, but there is considerable merit in this scene." The first act ends with the following simile:

So the pure limpid stream when foul with stains
Of rushing torrents, and descending rains,
Works itself clear, and as it runs refines;
Till by degrees, the floating mirror shines,
Reflects each flower that on the border grows,
And a new Heaven in its fair bosom shows.

Macaulay writes: "A pretty simile but dreadfully out of place. Good heaven, what a contrast between this play and one of Shakespeare's." Without quoting further from the play, his comments explain themselves. Act II, scene 1, "Most of the debate is very heavy." Sempronius's speech in this scene, "My voice is still for war," is praised in the sentence "This is worthy of Lucan." Scene 2, "This I used when a boy to think the finest scene in the play. We shall see." Scene 3, "A fine piece of stilted conversation." Scene 5, "There is considerable skill in this scene." At the very end of this scene he writes, "Very good. There is more dramatic art in this scene than in any other in the play." In scene 6, the speech of Sempronius beginning "Thou hast seen Atlas," has the brief comment "Rant." In this mood, the scenes in Act III are dismissed with the words "Stupid trash," "Trash," "Exquisitely absurd," "Stuff." The first three scenes of Act IV are characterized as

"Abominable twaddle," "Nonsensical bombast," "Foolish nonsense." The fourth scene, where Cato meets the body of his son Marcus, fallen in battle, is praised in the sentence "This is the finest part of the play. Lucan might have written it." Cato's famous soliloquy on immortality, in the opening scene of Act V, is simply marked down the side of the page, without comment. At the close of the last scene is written "There is plenty of fine declamation in the play and one or two good dramatic touches, but it is even colder and duller and more turgid than I thought—the love scenes quite unbearable."

In July, 1843, eight years after he had made these amusingly pungent notes on *Cato*, Macaulay published his essay on Addison, a piece of writing that has done as much to establish firmly Addison's reputation as his own Tatlers and Spectators. While it would be absurd to take these pencil jottings too seriously, Macaulay had not forgotten them entirely. On Addison's poem to Sir Godfrey Kneller he had written in 1835 "Wonderfully ingenious. Neither Cowley nor Butler ever surpassed, I do not remember that they ever equalled it." In his essay on Addison, he observes: "In wit, properly so called, Addison was not inferior to Cowley or Butler. No single Ode of Cowley's contains so many happy analogies as are crowded into the lines to Sir Godfrey Kneller." Turning to the remarks on Cato in the essay, it is somewhat surprising to find the following opinion:

"About the merits of the piece which had so extraordinary an effect, the public, we suppose, has made up its mind. To compare it with the masterpieces of the Attic stage, with the great English dramas of the time of Elizabeth, or even with the productions of Schiller's manhood, would be absurd indeed. Yet it contains excellent dialogue and declamation, and, among plays, fashioned on the French model, must be allowed to rank high; not indeed with *Athalie* or *Saul*; but, we think, not below *Cinna*, and certainly above any other English tragedy of the same school, above many of the plays of Corneille, above many of the plays of Voltaire and Alfieri, and above some plays of Racine. Be this as it may, we have little doubt that Cato did as much as the Tatlers, Spectators, and Freeholders united, to raise Addison's fame among his contemporaries."

Here speaks not the critic, but the eulogist of Addison, for all discussion of the play on its own

merits is carefully avoided. Readers of *Cato*, despite their admiration for the author of the *De Coverley* papers, will feel that though these disconnected notes reflect in their severity a mood which prevents us from considering them too curiously, they yet show a true realization of the faults of this once popular drama, and contain in their very bluntness an impartial criticism lacking in the carefully considered periods of the famous essay.

EDWARD B. REED.

Yale College.

CERVANTES AS A DRAMATIST.

I. THE INTERLUDES.

In 1615,—with approval of July 3,—Cervantes published eight plays and the same number of interludes. In the prologue the author states that some years previous he had an opportunity of returning to his former leisure, and so he set about writing plays. But, as theatre-managers declined to buy his dramatic works, he consigned them to a chest, condemning all, as he says, to perpetual silence. Meanwhile, a bookseller-publisher (*librero*) told Cervantes that he would buy the plays if a prominent theatre-manager (*autor de título*) had not assured him that much could be expected from Cervantes' prose,—a statement that would be made only after the publication of *Don Quixote*, 1605,—but from his verse, nothing! Whereat the would-be dramatist was sorely grieved and lamented on the change of times and tastes. But he glanced over his plays and interludes, and, concluding that they were not wholly unworthy of publication, sold them at a reasonable price. "I took the money," says the author, "meekly, without having to higgler with actors (*recitantes*)."
Cervantes, hidalgo as he was, manifested uncommon sensitiveness in such matters. In the *Adjunta al Parnaso*, Pancracio says to him, "Why are your plays and interludes not acted on the stage?" To which Cervantes replies, "because theatre-managers do not seek me, and I do not seek them." It seems incredible that some such good friend of his, among actors, as Pedro de

Morales did not act as intermediary. Was there, indeed, a cabal, headed by Lope, the dictator, contriving against Cervantes, the playwright? Alas, the theatre-manager's estimate of the selling value of Cervantes' dramatic works proved to be all too true, for only one edition appeared during the seventeenth century. The volume has an interest all its own, because it was the first authorized edition of romantic plays published in Madrid. But we are here concerned more with the conclusions that may be drawn from the prologue: (a) The plays were written some time previous to their publication in 1615; (b) they were written at one and the same time,—*volví yo á mi antigua ociosidad . . . volví á componer algunas comedias . . .*; (c) The interludes were apparently written during the same period of dramatic production,—this is not stated expressly by Cervantes. But he says:

"Torné á pasar los ojos por mis comedias y por algunos entremeses míos que con ellas estaban arrinconadas, y ví no ser tan malas ni tan malos que no mereciesen salir de las tinieblas del ingenio de aquel autor . . ."

It will be noted that the interludes had been laid away with the plays, and, mark the word, he takes care to note that they, too, were not so malos as not to be worthy of publication. In other words, they had been consigned to the chest at the same time as the plays, and, of course, for the same reason. It is true that his interludes are almost wholly in prose, but one is in verse and all of them contain some verse.

Much has been written on the various periods of Cervantes' dramatic activity. This will be treated in a subsequent article, but attention may be called here to the fact that our author returned to the drama even after the *algunos años* he referred to in the above prologue. In his *Adjunta al Parnaso*, licensed September 16, 1614, the author states that he then had six plays and as many interludes. There are eight of each in the edition of 1615. The conclusion arrived at by Ticknor, namely, that the extra works were written after 1614 seems justified, but not because of the extra plays, for Cervantes had composed more than thirty from which he might select for the edition of 1615, but because in the prologue referred to above he avers that he was then (*i. e.*

in 1615) writing a play; "a comedy which I am composing, entitled, *El engaño á los ojos*." So too, after what has just been said there is no justification whatsoever for the conjecture of Hazañas de la Rua,¹ that the six plays alluded to were the six that Cervantes in 1592 agreed to write for Rodrigo Osorio.

In the biographies of the author of *Don Quixote* and in the special treatises devoted to his dramatic works may be found various vague and contradictory guesses at the possible dates of his second last (not last!) dramatic period. Surely it was not so far back as 1598–1603 as Díaz de Escovar would have us believe.² Morel-Fatio is nearer the mark in placing it vaguely, "*dans les dernières années de sa vie*."³ Knowing as little as we do of Cervantes' activities after the publication of *Don Quixote* in 1605, it is idle to speculate on the time when, as he tells us, he could return to his former leisure (*antigua ociosidad*). The interludes themselves give a safer clue. In *El Vizcaino fingido* reference is made to *Don Quixote* (the published work), proof sufficient to explode Díaz de Escovar's bubble. In the same interlude there is a possible allusion to a play written about 1611, and extremely popular, *La Ventura de la fea*,⁴ as also to the pragmatic against the indiscriminate use of coaches proclaimed January 3 and 4, 1611. In the *Cueva de Salamanca* mention is made of the bandit Roque Quinart, possible only after 1607. In *La Guarda Cuidadosa* a letter (*cédula*) is dated May 6, 1611. All this goes to show,—and more allusions might be cited,—that the interludes were written about 1610–12, probably indeed while the author was revising the *Exemplary Novels*, presented for approval by July 2, 1612. Mr. Fitzmaurice-Kelly has truly said,⁵ "few points in his history are more inexplicable than the fact that; after the amazing success of *Don Quixote*, he published practically nothing for the next eight years" (1605–1613). Doubtless during a part of this time, and largely because of the "amazing success" of his masterpiece, Cervantes was vainly courting Thalia in his endeavor

¹ *Los rufianes de Cervantes*, 1906, p. 8.

² *Apuntes escénicos cervantinos*, . . . 1905, p. 42.

³ *Études sur l'Espagne, série I*, p. 377.

⁴ Cf. *M. L. N.*, xx, p. 41.

⁵ *Galatea*, 1903, p. xxxviii.

to drive the wolf from his door. What records we have of our author during this period spell direst poverty.⁶ Rodríguez Marín, for purely stylistic reasons, supposes that the interlude entitled *El Rufián viudo* was composed before 1600. Such a conjecture is probably not warranted.⁷

Only a word need be said here about the relation of the *entremeses* to Cervantes' other works. Many of the characters reappear in *Don Quixote* and the *Novelas ejemplares*, to which they are most closely akin in manner, matter, and style. They form the humblest and least pretentious group in the author's trilogy, and like the two productions just mentioned, but unlike his verse plays, or poems, and pastoral romance, were most congenial to his temperament. The author of *Don Quixote* was, without doubt, most successful when most national. But there are other, and more definite, points of contact. Thus, for instance, in *La elección de los alcaldes*, a blanketing episode repeats Sancho Panza's unfortunate experience.⁸ In the same interlude the wine-test story of Part II of the *Don Quixote* is anticipated, with only minor verbal changes.⁹ In *El viejo celoso*, in addition to the parallel situation in *El celoso extremeño*,—*più non si pareggia mo ed issa*,—studied by Rodríguez Marín,¹⁰ and Eugenio Mele,¹¹ attention may be called to a comical touch which Cervantes repeats. The wife says of her jealous husband that,

"no me clavara él las ventanas . . . desterrara della los gatos y los perros, solamente porque tienen nombre de varón."

In the *novela* it is said of the husband,

"aun no consintió que dentro de su casa hubiese algún animal que fuese varón. A los ratones della jamás los persiguió gato, ni en ella se oyó ladrado de perro: todos eran del género femenino . . ."

⁶ Máinez, in *Cervantes y su época*, p. 564, synthesizes very ably the new material collected by Pérez Pastor.

⁷ Cf. *Rinconete y Cortadillo*, 1905, p. 155.

⁸ Imitated by Mira de Amescua in *La monja de Portugal*.

⁹ This story is not unknown in America, where it is told of two Southern judges, and very appropriately a leather-headed tack is found in the cask. If I remember well, this version is found in Cox's *Why we laugh*,—not now accessible to me.

¹⁰ *El Loaysa* . . . 1901, *passim*.

¹¹ *La novella El celoso extremeño*, *Nuova Antologia*, 1^o ottobre, 1906.

In this same interlude we seem to be listening to a conversation between Don Quixote and Sancho Panza. Elsewhere we are transported to the world of indigent students, and soldiers, sacristans, gypsies, panders, convicts, jangling *malmaridados*, in a word, the lower strata of that *callejera* society which Cervantes could depict so successfully. But in his choice of types of character, Cervantes manifested no originality, for all these personages had already appeared in the novellistic and dramatic literature of Spain. The vivacity of dialogue which the interludes have in common with our author's other works and which seems so peculiarly his own, had been practised by Cervantes' eminent predecessors (e. g., Lope de Rueda) in popular literature.

The interludes of our author deserve, therefore, despite the fact that they are essentially of the *género chico*, a high place in his productions. It is only an aristocrat like Ticknor who would, as Cervantes had done when ill-advised, consign them to a chest and eternal silence. Ticknor, here as elsewhere, set up an artificial standard and measured the works that came into his ken as Goldoni's Ottavio measured eggs with a ring; *questo passa, questo non passa*. It is time for us to judge for ourselves and to get out of the charmed circles of a Ticknor and a Schlegel.¹² The farcical interludes are Cervantes' most successful dramatic works, and are, indeed, a credit to the creative faculty and facility which produced the *Exemplary novels* and the *Don Quixote*.

Cervantes, who theorized in and out of season on the novel and the comedia, has said almost nothing about his conception of a proper interlude. For his types of character he followed the school of Lope de Rueda. The norm fixed by Lope has never suffered much change, and in this respect the history of the interlude in Spain is very different from that of the comedia. No violent innovations were introduced and hence, too, there was no need of theorizing. Cervantes boasts, in the prologue so often referred to, that the language used in his *entremeses* befits the rank of the speakers, but this is true of Lope de Rueda's *pasos* as

¹² In the margins of Ticknor's copy of Royer's translation of the interludes are many exclamation marks, eloquent signs of protest against Royer's more favorable estimate.

well. The dance element was probably greatly developed, but at least one of Lope's interludes concludes with a dance, and as is well known only a part of his work has been preserved. Again, in the use of prose, Lope's example was followed. Cervantes wrote two of his interludes in verse, but there was a precedent for this in Lope de Rueda's *Farsa del Sordo*,¹³ which is a kind of interlude.

As dances form such an important part of some of Cervantes' *entremeses*, it is worth while dwelling upon some of his remarks on the subject. In *La gran sultana*¹⁴ he ascribes to a certain Alonso Martínez the invention of

"aquesos bailes
Que entretienen y alegran juntamente
Más que entretiene un entremés de hambriento,
Ladrón ó apaleado."¹⁵

Cervantes reference to three favorite characters of the interludes is not exhaustive. That our author realized that the dance was part and parcel of the interlude is seen in a passage of his play, *La entretenida*, written about the same time as the *entremeses*:¹⁶

Marcela. Mira Cristina, que sea
El baile y el entremés,
Discreto, alegre y cortés,
Sin que haya en él cosa fea.

Cristina. Hanle compuesto Torrente
y Muñoz, y es la maraña
Casi en mitad de Ocaña
Que es un poeta valiente.
El baile, te sé decir
Que llegará á lo posible
En ser dócil y apacible,
Pues tiene que ver y oír;
Que ha de ser baile cantado,
Al modo y uso moderno;
Tiene de lo grave y tierno,
De lo meliflúo y flautado.
Es lacayuno y pajil
El entremés, y me admira
De verla una tira mira
Que tiene de fregonil.

¹³ Lope de Vega and Benavente wrote their interludes in prose, the accepted medium. See also Rouanet, *Les intermèdes espagnols*, 1897, *passim*.

¹⁴ *Teatro completo* (*Biblioteca clásica*), 1896, p. 392.

¹⁵ Cf. "Como los entremeses solían acabar por la mayor parte en palos," in ed. 1864, VIII, p. 251.

¹⁶ Volume III, p. 176.

The parties then leave for a rehearsal; later the dance is given but without the interlude.

(To be continued.)

MILTON A. BUCHANAN.

University of Toronto.

FELGEROLE.

The word *felgerole*, *polipodium*, noted by Manitius, "Angelsächsische Glossen in Dresdener Handschriften," *Anglia*, XXIV, pp. 432, 433, is there left unexplained. The reference to an article by R. Fuchs, *Archiv f. latein. Lexicogr.*, x, 354, may have implied such an explanation, but the Romance origin of the word, if there stated, might have been given, thus sparing the curious a fruitless search for a Germanic source for *felgerole*. Indeed, the separation of the word at the end of the line, *felge-rothe*, p. 433, l. 5, indicates that the Romance origin of the word has not been offered.

Two variants in *felgerotha*, *felgerothe*, seem to complicate the problem. At first glance the word looks as if it might be a Germanic or Celtic compound, and if a compound the chances are that it would be of Germanic or Celtic origin, preferably Celtic, 'auf französischen boden.' I can, however, find no word corresponding to the first element, *felge*, in either stock. The supposition remains that the word is single, the *-ole*, *-othe* ending having been added by analogy with other words for the same thing.

Among other words for polypody are the OE. *eoforfearn*, the L. *radiolus*, *filix* (*arboratica*, *quercina*), *filicula*, *herba radioli*, the It. *felcequercina*, and finally the Fr. *fougère*. A mid-form for Fr. *fougère* in **felger-* may be assumed; indeed, nothing short of this satisfies both phonology and meaning. The ending of *felgerole*, *-othe*, then offers less difficulty: analogy with **radiole* (< *radiolum*) and with **polipode* (< *polipodium*), cf. English *polipody*, both older words for the same thing, would explain the presence and the form of the ending.

It should be noted that OE. *eoforfearn* (ME. *everfern*) given in the Durham Gloss for *polipo-*

dium, and rendering *herba radiola* in the OE. version of the *Herbarium Apuleii* (Cockayne's *Leechdoms*, I, p. 34) is not expressly connected with the oak; but allusions to the oak are surprisingly rare in the *Leechdoms*. The Saxon version is almost literal in its rendering of the *Herbarium*, c. lxxxv, where the oak-polipody is not mentioned. Everfern grows 'on stanigum stowum' (lapiditis) and 'on caldum hus' (parietis). The *Læce Boc* is indefinite: 'bruce gledenan and eforfearnes uppe on treowe,' II, p. 130. Still the references in the Glossary to *Leechdoms*, II, s. eforfearn, leave little doubt that everfern, *filix quercina*, *radiolus* and *polipody* of the oak are the same.

Everfern is not behind the other Saxon simples in the variety of its virtues. It is good for headaches, *Herb.*, lxxxv; for cough, *Læce Boc*, I, xv, 2; *Lacnunga*, 112; for pain in the heart, *L. B.*, I, xvii, 3, and cf. lxiii, 'for the phrenzied' (*wip weden heorte*); for a wound-salve, *L. B.*, I, xxxviii, 10; for a burn, *L. B.*, I, lx, 4; for lung disease, *L. B.*, 2, li, 3, 4; for 'uhshte,' *Laen.*, 18; for pocks and skin eruptions in sheep, *Laen.*, 81; for falling out of the hair, *L. B.*, lxxxvii; for palsy, *L. B.*, I, lix; for swelling of the neck, *L. B.*, I, xii. Not the least of its virtues lay in the under parts: *eforfearn neoðe-weard*, *Laen.*, 81; 'Eft niðe-weard eforfearn gýbrifan,' *L. B.*, I, xvii, 3. Remembering the description of the plant in the *Herbarium*, 'heo hæfð on æghwyleum leafe twa endebyrdnyssa fægerra pricena and þa scinað swa gold,' one may suggest that this may have been the *aureus ramus* of the *Aeneid*, 6, 136 ff.; 201 ff. Professor Frazer's references to fern-seed, to St. John's oil, imply characteristics of the oak-polipody, rather than of the mistletoe.¹

W. P. REEVES.

Kenyon College.

¹ *The Golden Bough*, II, p. 363 f. I have no critical apparatus for Vergil, and am quite in the dark regarding comment on the lines. One should consult such references as are given in Gröber, *Grundriss*, II, 1, pp. 249, 258, 260, but these are out of my reach. I regret that I have only the first part of Berberich's dissertation on the M. E. version of the *Herbarium*, Heidelberg, 1900. Dr. Berberich there shows the difficulties of the scribes with the older Saxon characters, difficulties also apparent in Manitius's text of the Dresden glosses, corrected by Holt-hausen, *Anglia*, xxv, 387 f.

SPANISH BIBLIOGRAPHY.

Bibliografía Madrileña ó Descripción de las Obras impresas en Madrid, por el Presbítero Don CRISTÓBAL PÉREZ PASTOR, Doctor en Ciencias. Obra premiada por la Biblioteca Nacional en el concurso público de 1893, é impresa á expensas del Estado. Parte Segunda (1601-1620), Madrid, 1906.

Bibliografía Madrileña, etc. Parte Tercera (1621-1625), Madrid, 1907.

While the significance of Dr. Pérez Pastor's *Bibliografía Madrileña* was at once recognized, on the appearance of the first volume in 1891, these two parts, which now follow one another in rapid succession, after a lapse of nearly fifteen years, are of far greater importance. So fruitful have been the researches of this distinguished and tireless scholar that the student of Spanish literature always looks forward with eager expectation to a new volume from his pen, knowing that something hitherto entirely unknown is sure to be revealed to him. While these volumes, as their titles indicate, are mainly bibliographical in character, they contain numerous biographical documents of the first importance, which have been discovered by the author in the course of his laborious investigations. A few examples will give some idea of the value of Dr. Pérez Pastor's work. We begin with volume II:

No. 890 is a description of the first edition of the *Viaje entretenido* of Agustín de Rojas, published in 1603. In the preliminary pages and elsewhere in the course of this work, Rojas gives us a number of curious details concerning his life. To these the work before us adds the *Partida de bautismo* of Rojas, which is as follows:

"En dos de Setiembre (1572) se bautizó Agustín, hijo de Diego de Villadiego y Luisa de Rojas, vizcaina; fueron padrinos Luis Ferrer y Francisco Escoto, casados y estante en esta Corte.—El Licenciado Burguete. (Archivo parroquial de San Martín)."

We also learn from a Document here printed, dated at Valladolid, July 8, 1603, that Rojas, who had procured the privilege of printing and selling his *Viaje entretenido* for the period of ten years, disposed of this privilege to Francisco de

Robles, "bookseller to his Majesty," for the sum of one hundred ducats (= 1100 reals).

No. 873.—Interesting documents concerning Don Bernardino de Mendoza, including his last Will. (See *Bulletin Hispanique* (1906)).

No. 891.—The *Romancero General* of 1604. From marginal notes in two copies of this *Romancero* the authorship of quite a number of ballads has been determined. New facts in the lives of the following authors have been discovered by Dr. Pérez Pastor. Only a few, of particular interest to the writer, have been selected.

No. 957.—Juan Arze Solorzeno, author of *Las Tragedias de Amor*.

No. 989.—Bernardo de Balbuena, author of *El Siglo de Oro*. These are both pastoral romances.

No. 1016.—On the poet Juan Antonio de Herrera, who died on September 21, 1634. Cf. also No. 1561.

No. 1046.—On Bartolomé Leonardo de Argensola. Cf. Part III, p. 409.

No. 1073.—On Lope de Vega's *Jerusalén Conquistada*.

No. 1091.—Interesting data concerning D. Alonso de Ercilla y Zuñiga. Cf. Part III, pp. 359, 360 and 368.

No. 1130.—On Sebastian de Covarrubias Orozco.

No. 1177.—Concerning the historian Antonio de Herrera. Cf. Part III, pp. 380 and ff.

No. 1326.—Here the last Will and testament of Don Gonzalo de Cespedes y Meneses, *Coronista de S. M.*, is given, together with his *Partida de defuncion*;—he died in the calle del Sordo, Madrid, January 7, 1638.

No. 1377.—*Flor de Comedias de España de diferentes Autores*. Quinta Parte. Recopiladas por Francisco de Avila, vezino de Madrid. Madrid, 1615. Dr. Pérez Pastor makes it very probable that this edition,—which is quoted by Salvá,—never existed, but that the first edition was printed at Alcalá in that year. He also doubts the existence of the edition of Madrid, 1616.

No. 1412.—Many documents concerning the Licentiate Francisco Murcia de la Llana, *medico*, who, as *corrector de libros por S. M.*, had to read all the books,—good, bad and indifferent,—that

issued from the press for over thirty years. He died November 24, 1639.

No. 1538.—On the poet Vicente Espinel, *Capellan mayor* of the Bishop of Plasencia. We learn that he died on February 4, 1624.

No. 1553.—On Baltasar Elisio de Medinilla.

No. 1681.—Very interesting documents concerning the family of Don Francisco de Quevedo. Cf. Part III, p. 458.

We turn now to Part III. Here the results are even far richer. So much is here that is new and of the first importance, that it is very hard to make a choice.

Page 205.—Record of an action for breach of promise, in May, 1611, by Doña Mariana de Loaysa against the poet D. Juan de Jáuregui, who was mulcted in damages to the amount of 2000 ducats. He finally concluded to marry Doña Mariana, who withdrew the action or rather settled it in September, 1611. They were married on February 27, 1612 (p. 219).

Page 232.—On the *Orfeo* of Juan Pérez de Montalvan. On the title-page of the copy of the first edition (Madrid, 1624) in the Biblioteca Nacional, is written in a contemporary hand: "Este Orfeo le hiço Lope de Vega y le hiço en quatro dias." A copy in the Biblioteca de San Isidro contains the two following notes in a hand of the period: (1) "Este Orfeo aunque dice es de Jn^o perez de mon | no es sino de Lope de bega." (2) "No se puede esconder la dulçura de lope en este Orfeo y no ai duda en qe sea suyo." There is a similar inscription in another copy. The most important part of this volume is the second Appendix, entitled *Documentos*.

Page 325.—On Julian de Almendariz.

Page 335.—On D. Francisco de Borja, Prince of Esquilache. His last Will is dated Madrid, February 12, 1658. He died on October 26, 1658 (p. 338).

Page 343.—On D. Alonso de Castillo Solórzano.

Page 344.—On Don Guillén de Castro y Belvis. In the light of the documents here published, the biography of this distinguished dramatist assumes an entirely different aspect. The first, dated Madrid, January 8, 1619, is a power of attorney to Geronimo de Herrera to sell 900 copies of a volume containing twelve comedias, published at

Valencia, and which were in the possession of Juan Bautista de Valda, a Valencian merchant resident in Madrid, to whom he had pledged them for 2600 reals, the cost of printing and conveying them to Madrid. This amount was owing to Vicente Ferrer of Valencia, who had advanced the money for printing them. This shows that his *Comedias*, Part I, Valencia, 1618 (of which there is a copy in the University of Leyden, which I described in my edition of D. Guillen's *Ingratitud por Amor*, Philadelphia, 1899), was published with the knowledge and consent of the author.

Page 345.—Deed of gift (dated Naples, October 28, 1619), of D. Juan Tellez Giron, Marques de Peñafiel, to D. Guillen de Castro, during the life of the said Marquis of "el cortixo de el donadio de Casablanca en el termino de Arahál (Andalucía) que tiene mil y ciento y sesenta y cinco fanegas de tierras," the said D. Guillen to enjoy the rents and profits of the same from the time that the said Marquis shall succeed to the estate of his father, the Duke of Osuna: "the said D. Guillen to pay 3000 maravedises yearly while he shall enjoy it."

We learn that D. Guillen's sister, D^a Madalena de Castro, was the wife of D. Melchor Figuerola y Borja, Caballero de la Orden de N. S. de Montesa, and a citizen of Valencia, and that D. Guillen's brother was Fray Francisco de Castro, "de la Orden de Santo Domingo de predicadores," in Valencia.

Page 351.—Deed of gift of the Duke and Duchess of Osuna of 17000 ducats as a dowry to Doña Angela Salgado, who was in the service of the Duchess, and who was about to marry D. Guillen de Castro. There is also a grant to her of 300 ducats yearly during the life of the said Duke, dated November 16, 1626, beside other grants and donations by the Duke to the said Doña Angela. On January 28, 1628, there is an obligation by D. Guillen de Castro and Doña Angela de Salgado y Castro, his wife.

Page 356.—Last Will of D. Guillen de Castro, dated at Madrid, July 26, 1631, by which he declares that his body shall be deposited in the "Hospital de los Aragoneses," until it can be taken to the city of Valencia. By his will D. Guillen left everything to "Doña Angela Maria

Salgado y Castro, mi legitima muger, para que los haya, lleve, goce y herede con la bendicion de Dios y la mia y por lo mucho que la estimo y quiero."

In the light of this document, written on his death bed, we may see that few men, perhaps, have been more maligned than D. Guillen. The false reports concerning him and his marital relations have been handed down from one writer to another, and I set this down in partial atonement of my small share in this unfortunate business.

The inventory of D. Guillen's effects, filed by his wife on August 2, 1631, is a long list, and shows that he was very far from being poor, for he had besides a pension of 300 ducats: "una pension que tuvo sobre el arzobispado de Tarra-gona." But Doña Angela was not faithful to the ashes of her Sichæus, and on April 15, 1632, less than nine months after the death of D. Guillen, she married Nicolas Mitarte, and in 1636 or 1637 she married again, the third venture being D. Fabian de Contreras (p. 362).

Page 377.—Don Luis de Góngora y Argote. In December, 1617, he paid 3600 reals for a coach: "una carroza de baqueta leonada."

Page 385.—D. Rodrigo de Herrera y Ribera, dramatist, died in 1657. In his last Will he states that he had sold his comedia *Lo cauteloso de un Guante y confusion de un Papel* for 800 reals.

Page 391.—Don Diego Jiménez de Enciso, dramatist. Petition to the King, dated February 4, 1629, in which he complains of his age and his bodily ailments which prevent him from riding either in a coach or on horse and requesting permission to be carried in a "silla de manos."

Page 412.—Pedro Liñan de Riaza, clérigo presbítero, was the son of Roque de Liñan and Agueda de Riaza, both of Toledo. Liñan died on July 25, 1607.

Page 427.—Mira de Amescua.

Page 434.—Agustin Moreto.

Page 451.—Juan Pérez de Montalban. This article contains an interesting document concerning Lope de Vega.

Page 463.—Don Francisco de Rojas Zorrilla, born October 4, 1607.

Page 499.—Luis Vélez de Guevara. Among other interesting documents, there is a letter

dated February, 1633, beginning: "Yo estoy con la maior neçesidad y aprieto q̄ he tenido en mi vida," etc.

Page 518.—Cristóbal de Virués. On August 18, 1608, he sold the privilege for ten years of printing his *Monserate* and his *Obras traxicas y liricas* for 200 ducats. This proves that the edition of 1609 of the latter work is undoubtedly the first edition.

The above will give an idea of the great importance of the data collected by Dr. Pérez Pastor. These volumes are a very mine of information and are absolutely indispensable to the student of Spanish literature.

HUGO A. LENNERT.

University of Pennsylvania.

OLD-LORE.

Orkney and Shetland Old-Lore. London: Printed for the Viking Club. Nos. 1, 2, 3 (Jan., April, July), 1907.

Orkney and Shetland Old-Lore is the title of a new serial publication, issued under the auspices of the Viking Club and Society for Northern Research of London, and directed by A.W. Johnston, F. S. A. Scot., as general editor. The object of this series should commend itself to all students of Scottish antiquity and especially that of the Northern Isles. Although the Norse chroniclers have left a fairly complete history of the Island Earldom during the centuries that precede 1200, and though the transactions of the last 400 years are fully recorded in accessible archives, there remains a period of over three centuries of almost total darkness. And even of the last four hundred years a vast number of facts are still buried in Kirk Sessions and Registers House Records, in private charter chests, and elsewhere. The Viking Club now proposes, through the *Orkney and Shetland Old-Lore* series, to publish these and to translate and print for the first time information from all available sources regarding the period from 1200 to 1500, whether printed works, manuscripts, archæology, folklore, or what not. The

series will, in addition, be a medium of notes and queries for all interested in these subjects. The importance of the plan for the elucidation of Scottish History is obvious from the fact that it is found to be necessary to compile a separate *Diplomatarium* for Orkney and Shetland, a necessity arising from the fact that these islands had self-government for seven centuries, down to 1611. The publication will be issued quarterly to subscribers only, of which there are already, we learn, 560, a very large proportion of which so far is furnished by that enlightened but rather impoverished colony, The Shetlands. Each quarterly will contain about forty-eight pages, sixteen of which will appear under the caption "Miscellany," and 32 as "*Diplomatarium*." It is also planned to issue extra works from time to time. Under the *Miscellany* will be published facts relative to northern genealogy, folk-lore words and phrases, saga references to the British West, the archæology and early industries of northern Scotland and the Isles; further also photographs of antiquities, reports on old manuscripts and papers, and book reviews. Under this head the three numbers, so far issued (January, April, and July, 1907), contain, among other things, a list of "Orkney and Shetland Societies"; "Two Jacobean Sonnets, written in Orkney," by William Fowler, poet at the court of King James VI; an article on "The Odal Families of Orkney," by J. Storer Clouston, and one by R. Stuart Bruce on "Old Time Shetlandic Wrecks." Of particular interest in this last article is the account of the wrecking of *Gran Griffin*, a remnant of the *Invincible Armada*, in August, 1588, and of the experiences of the admiral Don Juan and his crew during the enforced stay of seven weeks on the Isle of Faire. Among relics of *Gran Griffin* are mentioned a gun, thirty inches long, now in Orkney, and some chairs taken from the admiral's cabin, and a silver flagon and drinking cup which are preserved in Shetland. There is further, from the pen of Jon Stefansson, a brief but appreciative account of the life of Bjarne Kolbeinsson, the Skald, Bishop of Orkney, 1188-1223, whom the author regards as "the greatest man that Orkney has yet produced"; J. J. Smith Leask contributes an account in Orkney English of "An Orcadian Battle, a Hundred Years Ago," and W.

G. Collingwood, translator of the *Life and Death of Cormac the Skald*, offers in numbers two and three a rendering of a "Legend of Shetland from the *Fljotsdaela Saga*." In addition there are a number of book reviews and much interesting matter under the "Notes" department. A writer here contributes a note on gender in the Orkney dialect; he cites the fact that, as late as fifty years ago, few Orcadians in ordinary conversation used the neuter gender, everything being masculine or feminine. This would seem to be a special development in the language of the Orkneys, for such was not the practice in Iceland, nor is it to-day in dialect speech in Western Norway, whence the colonists of Orkney came. It may, however, be said that the prevalence of the feminine pronoun is a characteristic of English folk-speech. Further investigation would probably show that it is the feminine pronoun that predominates also in Orkney English. Relative to the use of the masculine pronoun in referring to the weather I may, however, say that the use of the masculine pronoun here is to-day characteristic of most of the dialects of Norway, as (translating the original phrases) "he's cold to-day" for "it is cold to-day," or "he's snowing" for "it is snowing." The rule is therefore that natural phenomena are thought of as masculine and when referred to by substitutory pronouns, the masculine is always used. Part 2 of the Old-Lore series, which will contain the *Diplomatarium* or "Orkney and Shetland Records," begins in number I with extracts, translation, and notes from Adam of Bremen, referring to the earliest Bishops of Orkney, and extracts from Annals and Ecclesiastical Documents relative to the Isles, while in numbers 2-3 this part is devoted to "Shetland Sasines" for the years 1623 to 1625. In succeeding issues are to be printed Orkney Sasines and a number of Scotch, Latin, and Norse documents, collected last year in Scotland by Professor A. Taranger of Christiania on behalf of the Norwegian Government for a forthcoming volume of *Diplomatarium Norvegicum*. Copies of these documents have been given the Viking Club in advance of publication; the text is to be edited by Professor Taranger and the translation of the Latin and Norse papers will be made by Dr. J. M. Stefansson. There will also from time to time

be printed extracts and translations of Scottish, English, Welsh, Irish, and Manx records, as well as translations from Norwegian, Danish, and Icelandic archives. A special committee of the Viking Club with Mr. J. W. Cursiter, F. S. A. Scot., as chairman, is at present engaged in making a collection of place-names in Orkney, which will be edited on the side of their etymology by Dr. J. Jacobsen of Copenhagen, whose work on *Shetland Place Names* is also to be re-issued. It is planned finally to form a fund of £2,000 to be invested and the annual interest used in making special researches into the dialects and folk-lore of Orkney, Shetland, and the North of Scotland. This very great work which has been so creditably inaugurated deserves the support of all lovers of British history and "Old-Lore." That it will be conducted on a high plan of scholarship the name of the Viking Club and Society for Northern Research alone is a sufficient guarantee.

GEORGE T. FLOM.

University of Iowa.

DE MAUPASSANT.

ALBERT LUMBROSO : *Souvenirs sur Maupassant avec des lettres inédites Portraits, autographes, instantanées.* (Rome, Bocca frères, éditeurs, 1905, 705 pp.)

LOUIS THOMAS : *La maladie et la mort de Maupassant.* (Brochure in 12. Bruges, 1906, 101 pp.)

EDOUARD MAYNIAL : *La Vie et l'œuvre de Guy de Maupassant.* Paris : Société du Mercure de France, 1906, 296 pp.

No writer belonging to the present generation seems to appeal so much to the scholarly as well as to the general public as Maupassant. Whatever is printed about him is almost torn from the hands of the publisher.

The three publications whose titles have been given above have attracted a good deal of attention; they are very different in kind, however.

The bulky volume of the baron Lumbroso, interspersed with a score of interesting pictures,

contains many valuable documents in the form of personal "Souvenirs" gathered from friends and acquaintances of Maupassant. There are a number of letters, and also articles previously published but out of reach for the ordinary reader. Occasionally the editor adds a few personal remarks and anecdotes. The book ends with a few selections from Maupassant, illustrating his different styles.

There is no order whatsoever in the arrangement of the material. The chapter on the last illness and death of Maupassant comes before the one on the childhood and youth. They are separated by "Notes sur la mère de Maupassant" and Souvenirs of a friend on "Maupassant et son théâtre." After reprints of appreciations of Maupassant by G. Pellissier et Goncourt, comes an account of the inauguration of his statue at Rouen, followed by a "Bibliographie de Guy de Maupassant." Then a few pages concerning the relations of Taine and Maupassant; and again some "Détails inédits" on the childhood. . . . This not particularly picturesque disorder continues until the last page of the book. Moreover, the author does not mind in the least if he repeats a number of times the same piece of information. He is not very particular, at other places, about the nature of his information (*e. g.*, p. 240, his "Bibliographie des œuvres posthumes" is incomplete; while he puts (p. 238) "Les dimanches d'un bourgeois de Paris" among the works published during Maupassant's lifetime). He puts down, without noticing them, contradictory statements (*e. g.*, p. 76 he states, giving as his authority Madame de Maupassant, that several other guests were present at the last meal taken at her house, and p. 119 he gives an account of Madame de Maupassant again, to the effect that Guy was "en tête à tête" with his mother. Or, p. 239, the two women who seem to have hastened Maupassant's insanity come to see him ("cela est absolument sûr") at Cannes a few hours before his attempt to commit suicide, when p. 118 he produces Madame de Maupassant's account that he saw them at the Iles Sainte Marguerite on Christmas eve, thus a week earlier, and that they left for Paris the next day. Again, p. 293, a declaration of Maupassant's is reproduced to the effect that he was never "docile sur le chapitre

de la religion," and p. 300 we have the declaration of a friend "Il communia avec ferveur"). He overloads his book with unnecessary things (p. 597, he says that the Maupassants of Paris are in no way related to the family of Guy de Maupassant, and pp. 598 and 599 he offers all sorts of information concerning those people. See also pp. 91, 92, 95, 97). He tells us the whole story of the house where Maupassant was confined during his insanity, p. 804, and this house owned in the eighteenth century by the Princesse de Lamballe inspires him with very odd remarks: "Malgré nous, nous rapprochons de la mémoire de Guy de Maupassant celle de la belle Princesse. Les bourreaux qui l'ont saisie brutalement ne lui ont pas seulement ôté la vie, mais morte ils ont profané sa beauté et mutilé son sexe. Elle était coupable de dévouement à une Reine" (?).

It is only just to remark here that in the chapter on the childhood of Maupassant (pp. 287-300), the author mentions "en passant" the name of M^{lle} Ray (pseudonym: Madame Renée d'Ulmès) while borrowing word for word some of her anecdotes published in *La Revue*, and spoiling some others. As to *La Revue*, he never as much as mentions it.

With all those imperfections the book of baron Lumbroso, I repeat it, is full of very valuable material. In using it one must only be careful and not borrow any information without having previously ascertained that the statement is not perhaps contradicted in one of the other 704 pages of the volume. Even as it is the book will be widely taken advantage of.

It has already inspired two excellent monographs. One is the pamphlet of Dr. Louis Thomas: "*La maladie et la mort de Maupassant*," which, however, is not as valuable as the article by the same author on the same subject that appeared in the *Mercure de France*, June 1, 1905.

The other is Maynial's *La Vie et l'œuvre de Guy de Maupassant*, a very conscientious and keen piece of work. While the author borrows much from Lumbroso, he does not, however, confine himself to it; he has carefully read the *Journal des Goncourt* and the *Correspondance de Flaubert*, for instance, and he has looked up many of Maupassant's articles in the *Gaulois* and

in the *Journal*. It is by far the best biography of Maupassant that we have yet seen. The third part especially throws a great deal of light upon that part of Maupassant's life which begins with the year when he so suddenly rose to fame and which ends with the few weeks before his insanity, in fact, the time of his literary career about which up to now we knew very little. As to the fourth part, although Maynial says modestly that he cannot expect to add much to Thomas' pamphlet, it is a masterpiece of rich documentation, lucid criticism, and sober judgment.

Maupassant's works, in spite of the title of the book, are taken up only in so far as they are explained by the life. But there are some reasons to believe that we may expect before long another volume from the same pen. What makes us think so is that there are articles of Maynial published in recent years in the *Revue bleue* and in the *Mercure de France*, which seemed distinctly to be fragments of a general study and which have not been made use of in the volume now just issued.

A. SCHINZ.

Bryn Mawr College.

SHAKESPEARE.

Shakespeare and the Supernatural: a Brief Study of Folklore, Superstition, and Witchcraft, in 'Macbeth,' 'Midsummer Night's Dream,' and 'The Tempest.' By MARGARET LUCY. With a Bibliography of the Subject by WILLIAM JAGGARD. Liverpool: The Shakespeare Press, 1906. 8vo, pp. 38.

If Miss Lucy is akin to that Sir Thomas with whom the young Shakespeare had trouble, she has made ample amends for the knight's lack of insight. We regret, however, that we cannot speak of this as an important contribution to the subject. Prepared as a paper for the Stratford-upon-Avon Shakespeare Club, it is certainly interesting as a popular statement of certain matters; but before being printed it should, we think, have been expanded and to some extent recast. Much that is really irrelevant (e. g., the Queen's message, p. 25) should have been rigorously ex-

cluded; the excision would not have made it less readable.

Mr. William Jaggard has added a five-page bibliography of the subject. This becomes important in view of the fact that Mr. Jaggard now comes forward as the bibliographer of Shakespeare and announces, as approaching completion, "a bibliography of our national poet and playwright, including every known public or private issue of his plays, poems and collected works, and all known Shakespeariana in the English language whether manuscript or printed, embracing over fifteen thousand entries and references, with collations, copious notes, and a key to hundreds of anonyms and pseudonyms." From what he has done for Miss Lucy's book we may reasonably infer what he proposes to do for the larger work. We hope he will improve his method in several respects. He gives only the short titles, which are often inadequate; the dates; and the sizes. Scott's *Letters on Demonology and Witchcraft* (1830) are dated 1856. Listing only book titles, he omits such volumes as Halliwell, *Memoranda on the Midsummer Night's Dream*, Brighton, 1879; R. G. Moulton, *The Moral System of Shakespeare*, New York, 1903; S. Lanier, *Shakespeare and his Forerunners*, New York, 1902; E. Hense, *Ueber die Erscheinung des 'Geistes' im Hamlet*, Elberfeld, 1890; S. H. Hodgson, *Outcast Essays*, London, 1881; H. R. D. Anders, *Shakespeare's Books*, Berlin, 1904; H. Ankenbrand, *Die Figur des Geistes im Drama der englischen Renaissance*, Leipzig, 1906 (appeared in 1905); Martin W. Cooke, *The Human Mystery in Hamlet*, New York, 1888; to say nothing of a large number of periodical articles of such importance as Schelling's article in *Modern Philology*, I, 31-47, the article in *The Quarterly Review* for July, 1890, and Sigismund's "Die medizinische Kenntniss Shakespeare's" in the *Jahrbuch*, XVI, 39-143, XVII, 6-66, XVIII, 36-80.

Why, moreover, does Mr. Jaggard limit this undertaking to works in English? As every one knows, much valuable criticism has come from the Continent. If Mr. Jaggard is unable to handle the foreign bibliography, let him secure the co-operation of reputable Continental scholars, in order that the whole mass of material may be brought into one comprehensive scheme.

These shortcomings lead us to think that the general bibliography promised may not prove all that it ought to be. A word now as to bulk. The Deutsche Shakespeare-Gesellschaft has since 1864 printed in its *Jahrbuch* about 1350 pages of analytical bibliography, containing about 10,000 entries (in 1900-6, 4337, numbered), in several languages, of course; yet Mr. Jaggard promises us only fifteen thousand *in all*. If he intends to include in his work an index to the periodical literature, or even to the most important articles, his book, if it is to be adequate, will evidently need to be greatly enlarged; if he does not intend to provide such an index, he should make the fact clear at the outset.

CLARK S. NORTHUP.

Cornell University.

SPANISH LITERATURE.

El Sombrero de Tres Picos por D. PEDRO A. DE ALARCÓN, edited with Introduction, Notes, and Vocabulary by BENJAMIN P. BOURLAND, Professor in Adelbert College of Western Reserve University. New York: Henry Holt and Co., 1907. xvi + 250 pp.

It is surprising that in spite of Alarcón's popularity in America an edition of his masterpiece should have been so long in appearing. Unfortunately, much of Alarcón's literary production does not rise above mediocrity. His short stories, and his longer novels are too frequently marred by intemperance of language and conception, by melodramatic effects, often superficial and even grotesque. In his poorest stories like *El Final de Norma* and *El Niño de la Bola*, probability, motivation, and effective delineation of character are almost as conspicuously absent as in a novel of Georges Ohnet. But Alarcón has given us two short novels, *El Capitán Veneno* and *El Sombrero de Tres Picos*, where these characteristic defects are much less persistent and quite overshadowed by his personal charm as a story-teller. The first of these two novels has for some years been a

favorite in our schools and colleges. Professor Bourland now offers an excellently edited text of Alarcón's masterpiece.

The *Sombrero de Tres Picos* is a picture of Spanish provincial life in the early years of the last century, a charming evocation of those Spanish days when public opinion had but little voice in the conduct of the nation, when good or evil action depended upon the virtue or vice of individuals. There are possibilities of tragic treatment in this story of conjugal devotion menaced by vicious old age. Yet Alarcón spares us a lugubrious denouement by confounding the lecherous villain in a mesh of ridicule. There is no attempt to preach a moral, there is a refreshing absence of tirade and cloying sentimentality, and it is left to the plot to work out the justification of virtue and the undoing of villainy. The charm of the story lies in its objectivity, its spirit of cheerful tolerance, its racy and piquant dialogue, its rapid and climactic action, but to the lovers of the "cosas de España," its finest flavor is found in its highly colored and truly Spanish setting.

There are three parts in the Introduction to the present edition, the first, a biography of Alarcón, the second, a brief appreciation of his work as a whole, the third, a discussion of the *Sombrero de Tres Picos* and its sources. An abundance of useful information is condensed in these few pages of introduction, and the presentation leaves nothing to be desired.

The notes, which the Preface tells us are intended for the teacher rather than the student, are models of judicious selection and accurate scholarship. Spanish life and social habits are so essentially different from our own that a set of notes appended to almost any Spanish text, would they be more than perfunctory, must clear up any number of local and historical references and explain especially those difficulties of language which are rather social and historical in character than syntactical. In this the editor has been entirely successful. His notes could hardly be more thoroughly accurate or illuminating.

Unfortunately the work in the vocabulary is less creditable. We find there not infrequent faults of interpretation and omission, and not always the best judgment in the explanation of difficulties. The length and scope of the following comments

may be justified by the importance of both the text itself and the present edition.¹

2, 18, *se han enterado ya de que* . . . A better treatment than *enterarse*, "to inform oneself," would be *enterarse(de)* 'to learn,' 'find out.'—2, 19, *así que*. 'As soon as' seems better than "when."—3, 13, *andando* should be translated 'passing by.'—6, 7, *recelase*. The translation 'suspect' seems preferable to "fear."—6, 13, *personas principales*. The vocabulary gives "chief (principal) persons." The more idiomatic 'people of standing' seems better.—7, 8, *trastorno* is translated "overthrow," "upsetting." 'Disturbance,' 'upheaval' make better English.—8, 12, *biscocho*. "Biscuit," "cracker," "zwieback" are not equivalents. The *biscocho* is a sweet cake, small and of varied shape, like our cooky. 'Ladyfinger' is the closest English translation.—11, 3, *parra* means 'grapevine,' which fits the sense here. I do not know of any authority for the translation "arbor."—11, 7, *por Pascuas*. I am inclined to doubt the accuracy here of the free rendering "on special occasions." Why not the more natural 'at Christmas time,' especially as the *mantecado* mentioned in the passage is among other things a Christmas food?—13, 16, *requebrar*, translated "to court," "pay court to" does not usually mean at the present time more than 'to pay compliments to,' 'to flatter,' which exactly fit the context.—17, 7-8, *dejado que hubo*. This idiomatic construction occurring here and elsewhere in the text certainly requires some explanation.—17, 17, *ocurrencia* is said to mean "idea." 'Sally,' '(witty) remark' are better translations. Cf. *Dicc. Acad.*, "*dicho agudo y original que ocurre á la imaginación*."—18, 7, *penetrarse* is not reflexive here as the vocabulary has it. *Se* belongs with *empezar* and has the force of the indefinite subject 'one,' 'they.'—20, 29, *invernadero* is said to mean "winter house," "winter dwelling." Here it is synonymous with *invernáculo*, 'greenhouse,' 'hothouse.'—26, 21, *realce* is correctly translated in the vocabulary "relief embroidery," but the rendering of *de realce* by "elegantly," "richly," is misleading. Cf. *Dicc. Acad.*, "*bordar de realce, hacer un bor-*

dado que sobresalga notablemente en la superficie de la tela." So *bordados de realce* would mean 'embroidered in raised work.'—29, 9, *convenir*. Add to its meanings 'to be advantageous.'—30, 24, *más fácil sería que yo te dejase* . . . The vocabulary gives *fácil*, "easy." Of course, *fácil* means 'likely' here.—32, 15, *¡pedazo de bárbaro!* In a note this phrase is translated "you wild man," which is too insipid. *Bárbaro* in the vocative has a general condemnatory force which in this passage might be brought out roughly by 'You confounded numskull!'—32, 28, *For pillar in creyendo pillar me durmiendo la siesta*, the vocabulary gives "despoil," "rob." It means here 'to catch' ("thinking to catch me taking a nap"). Cf. *pillar una indigestión*.—42, 16, *Dios lo bendiga y me lo conserve más años que le conservó el suyo á mi Lucas*. *El suyo* certainly requires elucidation. It probably refers to the bishop mentioned on page fifteen, who was Lucas' protector in earlier years.—43, 11, *Zorro* is defined as "fox." Its pejorative force in Spanish should be brought out.—43, 18, *racimo*. I can find no authority for the translation "grape."—47, 17, *rezar* means here 'to mutter,' not "to pray."—49, 28, *habrá la de San Quintín* refers us to a note which is an unnecessarily detailed account of the battle of St. Quentin. A word of historical explanation is enough, since after all, the student wants a translation of the idiom which means, 'there will be the devil to pay.'—52, 20, *se me hubiera ocurrido*. The vocabulary should bring out the peculiar reflexive use of *ocurrir* (*ocurrírsele á uno*) as is done later on for *olvidar*, 53, 7.—57, 27, *desalmado*, erroneously defined as "dead man (pp. of *desalmar*, to kill)," means 'heartless, cruel person.' I have personally never heard of the verb *desalmar*, "to kill."—61, 4, *volver de visita al molino*. It is not *volver de visita* (cf. *voc.*) but *volver de visita á*, which means to 'revisit.' Yet ". . . le peguen fuego á la casa" (61, 7) is explained in the vocabulary as follows: *pegar fuego á*, "to set fire to." Here the *á* is unnecessary, since it would have its usual English equivalent "to" in the phrase "to set fire to."—62, 6, *beberse*. The force of the *se* is peculiar here having the idea of 'up' in the English 'to drink up,' and ought to be explained.—66, 1, *¡alcaldes á mí que soy de Archena!*, has an inter-

¹ The references are to page and line of the Bourland edition.

esting note, but only by inference can the student get from it the meaning, 'Just imagine mayors pitting themselves against me, a man from Archena!'—78, 7, *estar para* (inf.) is said to mean "to be in the mood to," "to be inclined to." Though the reverse is possible, *estar para* (inf.) usually means 'to be on the point of (doing),' and *estar por* (inf.) 'to be inclined (to do).' The Corregidor says in substance: "Let me tell you all about it. Why, I came near being drowned!" It would not be intelligible in the context were he to say: "I felt inclined to drown myself."—82, 23, *pobre hombre* is called "poor guileless creature." The context indicates a more salacious meaning. Garduña thinks the Corregidor is only 'half a man.'—79, 15, *sé ir á Madrid*. *Saber* seems to mean here, 'to be able to,' 'be capable of,' which are not given.—95, 18, *reventar* is translated for this passage "to weary," "wear out." It means here, to 'burst,' 'smash.'—121, 7, *se sentía*. *Sentir* is not given as a reflexive verb.—121, 16, *observara*. Certainly the pluperfect indicative force of the -*ra* ending should be explained in a note.

I have noted in the vocabulary the following inadvertencias:

Frontera (5, 17) and *criminales* (27, 3) are called adjectives.—14, 14, *y eso que no había* . . . The vocabulary gives *eso que no*, "although." But the *y* is quite necessary to the idiom, *eso que no* alone meaning nothing.—*Mole* (14, 19) and *credencial* (73, 19) are called masculine.—15, 17, *tomó la licencia absoluta*. The idiom as it occurs in the text is not *tomarse licencia absoluta* (cf. voc. under *licencia*), but *tomar la licencia absoluta*.—15, 19, *se casó con ella*. The vocabulary has *casarse*, equivalent to the intransitive English "to marry." This passage requires *casarse con*, 'to marry' (trans.).—60, 15, *echar á correr* is referred for explanation to the vocabulary under *echar* as *echarse á*, "to begin." Of course, the reflexive *se* does not occur in the idiom *echar á correr* on page sixty.—93, 1, *tal y como* means, not "just exactly" (cf. voc.) but 'just exactly as.'—223 (voc.). Improper punctuation and order cause *petate* incorrectly to mean "bolster," "mattress" on p. 31, l. 10, of the text.

In certain idioms containing verbs it is advisable to include in the vocabulary the preposition

that may depend upon these verbs. For example, in *de que se trata* (4, 9), it is not *tratarse* (cf. voc.) but *tratarse de*, which means "to be a question of." In the same way "*dar comienzo á*" (4, 17) without the *á*, is not equivalent to the transitive verb "to begin," or *parecerse* without *á*, to the transitive verb "to resemble." In these and several other instances the vocabulary omits the preposition from the idiom and yet inconsistently keeps it in the case of *encararse*(*con*) 74, 13, and *burlarse*(*de*) 74, 28.

Lope says somewhere:

"Señales son del juicio
Ver que todo lo perdemos,
Unos por carta de más
Y otros por carta de menos."

One of the problems in compiling a vocabulary is to know what to omit and what to include, having in view the needs of the student. It is to be regretted that Mr. Bourland should have been led in so many cases to explain what is self-evident and yet fail at times to explain what is really difficult. The following simple idioms are translated: *á la luz de* (3, 9) "in the light of"; *á proporción* (14, 12) "in proportion"; *gusano de seda* (11, 29) "silk-worm"; *á mi favor* (12, 5) "in my favor"; *sin necesidad* (32, 12) "uselessly"; *con dureza* (54, 24) "harshly"; *por vía de* (67, 16) "by way of." For the following more or less difficult expressions no help is offered other than the translation in the vocabulary of the separate words that go to make them up: *por el orden de* (3, 16) 'of the kind of'; *ni tanto ni tan poco* (37, 30) 'It isn't as bad as all that'; *¿Qué ha de pasar?* (39, 1) 'What do you expect to happen?'; *hay que* (46, 6) 'one must,' 'it is necessary'; *he aquí* (71, 25) 'voilà'; *á más no poder* (32, 16) '(laughing) as hard as she could'; *á punto que* (125, 1) 'at the same time as'; *algo menos será* (84, 22) . . . 'not as bad as that.'

The presence of such words as *sentimental*, *interminable*, *natural*, *personal*, etc., etc., would indicate that the editor aimed at compiling a complete vocabulary. With this point in mind the following omissions have been noted:

Extenso (16, 12), *continuo* (17, 7), *vibrante*, *elástico* and *atractivo* (18, 10), *grave* and *meloso* (18, 11), *difícil* (18, 12), *ingenioso* and *persua-*

sivo (18, 14), *lealtad* (18, 15), *deseo* as subs. and *instintivo* (18, 16), *empírico*, *profundo* and *desdén* (18, 17), *cualquiera*, pron. as 'whatever' (18, 18), *ironía*, *burla* and *sarcasmo* (18, 19), *ostentar* (19, 6), *se* as 'one another' (22, 1), *rigidez* (38, 17), *sinnúmero* (4, 22), *requerir* (1, 21), *tener á bien*, as 'to see fit to' (1, 16), *para que*, conj., 'in order that' (2, 22; 51, 13), *tener por*, 'to consider as' (4, 22), *según*, conj., 'according as' (20, 21; 72, 28), *pues que*, conj., 'since' (55, 14; 91, 24), *cuarto*, as 'room' (72, 16), *exclamar para su capote*, 'to exclaim to oneself' (91, 27), *con tal de*, 'provided that' (49, 3), *que*, conj., 'until' (50, 13).

F. W. MORRISON.

United States Naval Academy.

GERMAN LITERATURE.

TRISTAN UND ISOLDE in den Dichtungen des Mittelalters und der neuen Zeit, von WOLFGANG GOLTHER. Leipzig, S. Hirzel, 1907. 8vo., 465 pp.

Karl Immermann wrote (March 13, 1831) to his brother Ferdinand, concerning *Tristan und Isolde*: "Jammerschade dass so prächtige Sachen unter den Gelehrten vermodern! Man muss sie dem Volke schenken." Golther's work, steeped in thoroughness and seasoned with appreciative enthusiasm, confirms Immermann's compliment to the material, shows what scholars have not been responsible for its neglect, what poets have attempted its revivification and how one can best present it to the people.

The introduction reviews previous *Tristan*-forschung, beginning with Walter Scott's edition (1804) of the English poem *Sir Tristrem*, which Scott wrongly ascribed to Thomas of Erceldoune. Scott's work is nevertheless valuable, since it contains the first comparative treatise on *Tristan* literature. Throughout the entire work Golther is charitable toward the confident, though erring beginner, he drastically scathes the man who doesn't improve upon his prototype and utterly condemns him who is inferior to his predecessor. Due praise is given to Von der Hagen and Bü-

sching's edition (1809) of *Das Buch der Liebe* which contained the 1587 edition of the German *Prosaroman* and which called forth from J. Grimm (1812) a criticism replete with thoroughness and literary insight. The rest of the introduction is devoted to Von der Hagen's edition (1823) of Gottfried von Strassburg, Francisque Michel's valuable initiatory work (1835-39) on the French texts, especially those of Thomas and Berol, A. Bossert's monograph (1865), showing Gottfried's indebtedness to Thomas, Lichtenstein's first edition (1877) of Eilhart von Oberg, Gisli Brynjulfsson's work (1851) pointing out the importance of the *Tristramsaga* as an aid to the appreciation of Thomas, Golther's own monograph (1888) in which the Celtic and French elements are differentiated, Wilhelm Hertz's splendid editions (1894 and 1901) of Gottfried, Löseth's "sehr fleissige kritische Inhaltsangabe" (1890) of the French *Prosaroman*, and various other less significant monographs. Golther criticises Reinhold Bechstein's (1876) *Tristan und Isolde in deutschen Dichtungen der Neuzeit* as a work in which the bad is praised, the good is not recognized and the presence of the really great is not even faintly suspected. Golther's book proper is divided into nine "parts," the first of which deals with "Das Gefüge der Fabel." The Saga of *Tristan und Isolde* is based upon "Märchen, Novellen" and "Romanmotive," together with some historical elements and rests upon three main pillars: Morholt, the golden haired virgin and the antique motif of Paris and Oenone. The historical features are to be found in the *Morhaltabenteuer*, the romance in the other two constituent parts. An etymological study of the names of the six principal characters gives some idea as to the elements contributed by different nations.

In part two Golther reconstructs the *Ur-Tristan* by comparing the four independent versions—Eilhart, Berol, Thomas and the French *Prosaroman*, a task likewise accomplished by Josef Bédier, from whom Golther differs in a few significant particulars. Golther concludes: This *Ur-Tristan* was written by a French poet of marked genius and broad scholarship, between the years 1140 and 1150, contained 6-7000 verses, was almost surely not written by Kristian

von Troyes, possibly by Robert von Reims, called *La Chièvre*. Because of the interest that always attaches to an ingeniously constructed hypothesis, part two is the most readable chapter in the entire book.

Part three treats Eilhart, Berol, and the French *Prosaroman*. Eilhart von Oberg, a Low Saxon of the neighborhood of Hildesheim, wrote about 1190, in Middle German, a *Tristant*, in which he followed his French model slavishly and was in turn imitated by the continuators of Gottfried, Ulrich von Türheim (1240) and Heinrich von Freiberg (1290). Berol's *Tristan*, 4487 verses of which are still extant, was written toward the end of the twelfth century, the French *Prosaroman* between 1215 and 1230. Golther discusses these in detail and also briefly reviews a number of thirteenth and fourteenth century Spanish and Italian *Tristans*. Of interest is the specimen of Geibel's translation of the fourteenth century Spanish *Don Tristan*.

Part four is devoted to Thomas and his imitators. Thomas himself was broadly read in different literatures and treated his subject at great length and with many fine literary touches as well as peculiarities, learned etymologies and puns. Concerning Thomas' personality, little is known. He was an Anglo-Norman and wrote in England about 1160. That he belonged to the clergy can not be proved. About forty years elapsed between Thomas' *Tristan* and that of Gottfried von Strassburg. The two facts known with certainty concerning Gottfried are that he wrote his *Tristan* between Wolfram's *Parzival* and *Willehalm* hence about 1210, and died before it was completed. Gottfried knew French better than any other M. H. G. poet, and was otherwise well trained. Although Gottfried's indebtedness to Thomas is considerable, he went further and finished what Thomas began. Gottfried gave the saga at once courtly and classical form and is therefore superior to Thomas. Other treatments of Thomas' poems are the 175 verses of a Low Franconian poem, the Norwegian translation of Thomas by a learned monk at the instigation of King Hákon Hákonarson (1217-63), some free Icelandic renderings, Danish *Tristan* songs and the English poem in 304 strophes of 11 lines each.

Part five discusses *Nachklänge* of *Tristan* in epic and lyric forms, especially in the poems of

Kristian von Troyes. Part six reviews the *Tristanlais* and *Tristannovellen*: The *Folie*, Marie de France's *Gaisblattlai*, *Donnei des Amants*,—an Anglo-Norman poem of the twelfth century, Dirk Potter's (1411-12) *Minnenloep*, "Tristan Spielmann" and "Tristan Mönch." Part seven discusses the German *Prosaroman* and Hans Sachs's impossible *Tragedia mit 23 personen, von der strengen lieb herr Tristant mit der schönen Königin Isolden und hat 7 actus*.

The 162 pages of part eight are replete with scholarly criticism of the "Tristandichtungen der Neuzeit." Wieland brooded over a *Tristan* epic for about 30 years, wrote however, nothing. A. W. Schlegel finished in 1800 the first canto of *Tristan* in 91 strophes. He followed Gottfried closely. F. Rückert began a *Tristan* epic, taking up the story where Schlegel left off. The first canto of 32 strophes gave promise of a masterpiece. Immermann planned as early as 1832 his *Tristan*, left it until 1838, took it up again and worked on it until his death in 1840. Tieck thought of finishing it, but found it impossible. Wilhelm Wackernagel published in 1828 a *Tristan* epic, "ein Musterbeispiel schwungloser, gelehrter Poesie." K. P. Conz wrote (1821) *Tristans Tod*. His work based on Heinrich von Freiberg, has some merit. *Tristans Tod*, by F. W. Weber, first published in 1896, is of no value. Section two reviews the Gottfried revivals: Oswald Marbach, Wagner's brother-in-law, made (1839) the first attempt at a faithful rendering of Gottfried in modern German. The first complete version of Gottfried in modern German was the splendid rendering of Hermann Kurz (1844). To Gottfried's 19552 verses, Kurz added 3700. A. A. L. Follen treated (1857) the history of *Tristan's* ancestry in a way that makes the poem worthy of more notice than it has received. Karl Simrock's insipid unappreciative translation appeared 1855, W. Hertz's masterly translation 1877, Karl Pannier's Reclam translation 1901. Section three discusses ten *Tristan* dramas: Platen's promising but unfinished work (1825-27), the wretched production of Friedrich Roeber (1854), Josef Weilen's weak effort (1858) based on Immermann and dedicated to Grillparzer, Ludwig Schneegans' inane parody on Wagner (1865), Albert Gehrke's unpoetic drama (1869), Carl Robert's worthless piece of dramatic theft from

Wagner and Schiller (1866), Michael Rützel's unsuccessful *Isolde* (1893), A. Bessel's faint effort (1895) characterized as "Wagner verbeselt," Ernst Eberhard's (1898) worst of all possible productions, and Albert Geiger's *Tristan* (1906), undoubtedly the most important and praiseworthy German *Tristan* drama of modern times. Golther suggests that Matthew Arnold's (1852) excellent *Tristan and Iseult* may possibly have influenced Wagner who was in London in 1855. From a number of other English *Tristans* one reads with keenest interest Golther's review of Swinburne's (1882) *Tristan of Lyonesse*, in which Swinburne is unreservedly praised. Golther has little to say in favor of the French *Tristans* by Armand Silvestre (1897), Georges Chesley (1904), Eddy Marix (1905). Under the heading "Tristanbilder" Golther mentions those of John C. Sargent (1884) as failures, praises however those of Hendrich, Strassen, Engels and Braune. In order to leave nothing unsaid he mentions the marble statuettes of Tristan and Isolde by Zumbusch.

Part nine is an unalloyed glorification of Richard Wagner. The construction of Wagner's *Tristan* has been fully cleared up by the publication (1904) of his letters to Mathilde Wesendonk. Wagner learned Gottfried from the Version of Hermann Kurz. The interesting question is raised as to whether Wagner was influenced by Novalis' *Hymnus an die Nacht*.

The work on the whole betrays at all times thorough, conscientious, conservative scholarship. The author states that he wishes some time to do for *Parzival and the Grail* what he has here done for *Tristan*. *Quod felix faustumque sit!*

ALLEN WILSON PORTERFIELD.

Barnard College, Columbia University.

GERMAN LITERATURE IN AMERICA.

Parke Godwin and the Translation of Zschokke's Tales. By JOHN PRESTON HOSKINS. Publications of the Modern Language Association of America. Vol. xx, No. 2, for June, 1905. Pp. 205-304.

An excellent study in a field that is attracting considerable attention at the present time, and

presented in a clear, readable fashion. The preliminary sketch of the introduction of German literature in America is brief, but the conclusions drawn are undoubtedly correct. And the writer has happily avoided an error that is frequently made in studies of this character, that of grossly exaggerating the importance and influence of the subject of his researches.

From material gathered in a study of the American periodical literature,¹ I would offer a few suggestions and a brief appendix to Mr. Hoskins' bibliography of translations from Zschokke.

The influence of Professor Blättermann in the South is scarcely a matter of question. An examination of the *Virginia Literary Museum*, a scholarly and belletristic journal published by the University of Virginia during his professorship, shows how great was the activity he displayed and inspired in the department of German literature, and the frequency with which this journal is cited by the other magazines, particularly in the South, is sufficient evidence of the scope of this influence. But the work of Francis Lieber in South Carolina from 1835 to 1857 should also be taken into account in considering the question of German influence in the South. Also that of Mrs. Ellet, Mary Elizabeth Lee and Professor C. J. Hadermann, who did much translating for the magazines.

Mr. Hoskins inadvertently observes that the *Democratic Review* (Washington, D. C.) began publishing short poems from the German as early as 1835, whereas, in fact, the first number of that periodical was not issued until October, 1837. And Mrs. Ellet's free rendition of Tieck's "*Klausenburg*" appeared in the same journal for 1844, not 1845, as stated.

To the "Articles on Zschokke," listed by Mr. Hoskins from the magazines, should be added a biographical sketch in the form of a review of the autobiography "*Selbstschau*," republished from the *London Critic* in *Littell's Living Age* (Boston), VIII, 482, 1845.

¹ *German Literature in American Magazines prior to 1846. Bulletin of the University of Wisconsin*, 1907. The writer hopes that especially the reference lists of this study may prove useful to those engaged in investigations similar in character to that of Mr. Hoskins.

Besides the translations of tales from Zschokke given by Mr. Hoskins, I find the following eleven numbers in the American magazines before 1846. Most of them are contained in periodicals not examined by him. Four, however, are from the *Southern Literary Messenger*, which he cites. There are nine tales in all, of which only two were known to him as having appeared in America in translation. All of them are complete except "*The Clairvoyante*," which is an extract from "*Die Verklärungen*," and "*The Hole in the Sleeve*," which is condensed :

1834. *The Leg (Das Bein)*. Given as "From the German," but not accredited to Zschokke. *Magnolia*; or, *Literary Tablet*, New York, I, 213.
1838. *The Leg (Das Bein)*. A different translation from the above, but also given as "From the German," and not accredited to Zschokke. *Bentley's Miscellany* (American reprint), New York, III, 480.
1839. *The Evening before the Wedding (Der Abend vor der Hochzeit)*. Signed M. L. P. Knickerbocker, New York, XIII, 329.
1839. *The Transfigured (Die Verklärungen)*. An editorial note says the translator is "a lady of Pennsylvania." *Southern Literary Messenger*, Richmond, v, 225.
1842. *The Clairvoyante* (from *Die Verklärungen*). *Magnolia*; or, *Southern Apalachian*, Charleston. New Series, I, 74, 152.
1844. *The Hole in the Sleeve. A Novелlette*. By Mrs. Ellet. "The following story is rather condensed than translated from one of Zschokke's tales (*Das Loch im Aermel*). Some liberties have also been taken with it." *Godey's Lady's Book*, Philadelphia, XXVIII, 222.
1844. *The Betrothal of Mr. Quint (Herrn Quints Verlobung)*. From the German of Zschokke. By Miss W. Barrington. *Graham's Magazine*, Philadelphia, XXIV, 88, 126, 172.

1845. *The Warlike Adventures of a Peaceful Man (Die kriegerischen Abenteuer eines Friedfertigen)*. From the German, by Mary E. Lee. *Godey's Lady's Book*, Philadelphia, XXX, 157, 217.
1845. *Walpurgis Night; or, The First Night in May (Die Walpurgisnacht)*. Translated from the German of Zschokke. By Mary E. Lee. *Southern Literary Messenger*, Richmond, XI, 267.
1845. *Slight Causes (Kleine Ursachen)*. From the German of Zschokke. By J. D. McPherson. *Southern Literary Messenger*, Richmond, XI, 402.
1845. *Five Eras in a Woman's Life (Die weiblichen Stufenjahre)*. From the German of Zschokke. (Signed) Mary E. Lee, Charleston, S. C. *Southern Literary Messenger*, Richmond, XI, 633.

S. H. GOODNIGHT.

University of Wisconsin.

CORRESPONDENCE.

CHAUCER'S *Prologue* 256.

To the Editors of *Mod. Lang. Notes*.

SIRS:—As to "His purchas was wel better than his rente" (Chaucer's *Prologue* 256), Professor Child used to tell his classes, something more than twenty-five years ago, that this was an old French proverb, equivalent to "His 'pickings up' were better than what he got regularly, i. e., than his income." Besides the oft-cited passage from the *Roman de la Rose*, we may consider the proverbial tone of a line in Froissart's *Joli Buisson*:—"S'il n'a rente, s'a il pourchas" (v. 2826). There must be many examples. That quoted by Professor Greenlaw from the Towneley plays (*M. L. N.*, XXIII, 144) shows the popularity of the proverb in England.

G. L. KITTREDGE.

Harvard University.